THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. VIII MAY, 1924 No. 47

EDITORIAL

THE HURSLEY SCHOOL—AN APPEAL

The *Church Times* for April 17 contained an appeal for £3,000 for building a new school at Hursley, Keble's home for thirty years. We have never yet appealed through this journal on behalf of any fund. But the present seems one of those cases where, if ever, such a custom may be broken; and we earnestly ask our readers to send to Canon Robinson (The Close, Winchester) or to ourselves, for remittance to him, what they can afford. Whether we think of Keble's contributions to sacred learning, or of his expression of Christian piety in life and verse, or of his incalculable share in the task of recovering for the English Church her Catholic heritage, we shall feel that the children's children of those whom he taught (and who in turn inspired *Lyra Innocentium*) should not lose the atmosphere and witness of a Church school in their midst. We cannot doubt that his spirit is interceding to-day, as of old, for the village where his ministry was spent. That his name is still one to conjure with was shown last year by its prominence in connection with the Anglo-Catholic Congress in London. But the spell of Keble's character, as his friendship with Arnold of Rugby showed, has been felt far outside any one interpretation of the Church of England; and here is an opportunity for all who believe that our Church schools are vital to the spiritual future of our country to bear practical testimony to that faith. The circumstances of this school have about them a unique symbolic significance. We believe that readers of Theology will be among the first to appreciate this, and would wish to help the fund for Hursley to the best of their power. We shall be glad to acknowledge in these pages any contributions that may reach us, whether large or small.

THE GOSPEL OF LIFE: A STUDY IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

I.—INTRODUCTION

1. The Problem.

The Fourth Gospel presents us with a complex problem. It is necessary first to disentangle from one another the elements of the problem, and to note their relations to one another. We are faced not by one question but by several questions. There is the question of the authorship of the Gospel, and there is the question of the historical character of the Gospel, this breaking into three subordinate questions: (1) Was there a ministry of our Lord at Jerusalem, such as the Gospel records? (2) What is the historical character of the detailed events composing the story? (3) What is the historical character of the discourses?

I should maintain that of all the questions as to the Gospel the last to be considered is the question of its authorship. And, in particular, I should maintain that the question of the authorship of the Gospel must be considered after the question of its historical character, on the ground that the historical character of the Gospel supplies a most important datum for determining its authorship.

Of the various branches of the question as to the historical character of the Gospel perhaps the question as to the historical character of the detailed events would naturally fall to be considered first, though it would lead almost immediately to the question, Was there a Jerusalem ministry? But this latter question and the further question as to the historical character of the discourses throw us back upon a prior question, prior to the whole consideration of the historical character of the Gospel—viz., What is the substance of the Gospel which is presented to us in these discourses as preached at Jerusalem?

This is a question not of historical but of literary criticism. The primary task of the literary critic in dealing with any book is to read the book and see what it says. In the case of the Fourth Gospel, as we cannot answer the question, Who wrote this book? until we have answered the question, Is the book historical or not? so we cannot answer the question as to its historical character until we have considered what the book has to say for itself, what it professes to tell us, and in particular what is the substance of the Gospel, which, in the framework of the historical events it professes to record, and in the form of

the discourses it contains, the Gospel presents to our view as preached at Jerusalem. The answer to this question here presented is that the Gospel which our Lord felt Himself charged to deliver at Jerusalem is the Gospel of Life.

The writer's statement of his own purpose in writing is given (xx. 31) in what was doubtless the original conclusion of the Gospel—"These are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life in His name." Life is the end. And we shall see that in the successive discourses, and in the story in which they are framed, life appears as the end of our Lord's mission, and His relation to the Father as the truth on which He is driven back to justify and explain the offer of life.*

2. Conditions of the Problem.

We are professing to consider what is the substance of the Gospel which is here represented as preached at Jerusalem. For the purpose of this inquiry we assume, what the story presented to us implies, that our Lord came to Jerusalem with a Gospel in His mind which He should preach there. Our Lord would not have made the periodical visits to Jerusalem and to the temple, on the occasion of the annual feasts, without reading the mind of Jerusalem, and forming His judgment on its faults. The atmosphere in which He found Himself when He came to take this Gospel to Jerusalem would be alien to His whole mind. It would be a spiritually hostile atmosphere. And it would be to the spiritual need revealed by this hostile temper that His Gospel would address itself. But the fact that the spiritual atmosphere was so wholly hostile would further condition the presentation of the Gospel. The Gospel would emerge under provocation. It would not come out in response to any spiritual demand in those whom He addressed, for there would be no such demand to elicit a sympathetic response of revelation. On the other hand, there would be spiritual truths to the apprehension of which the Jews ought to have brought special qualifications. Jerusalem had not for so long been a centre of religious thought for nothing. Her very antagonism to such truths would naturally take the form of an exaggerated emphasis on some elements in the truth, for the fuller apprehension of which she should have been prepared. It was, so to say, in a theologically minded atmosphere that the new revelation was to be offered and rejected. But, even in rejecting it, she would show that she had, if she could have used them, qualifications for accepting

* ζωὴ αἰώνιος occurs seventeen times in the Gospel, ζωή without αἰώνιος also seventeen times.

it, which could not have been found elsewhere. It was preached to those who, not by the act of God, but by their own temper and character, were predestined to reject it. The prejudice against which it had to contend, and which formed an insuperable barrier to its acceptance, would serve to bring to the front, and to put in a position of unnatural prominence, the theological truth which underlay the Gospel. In a moral atmosphere in which it could have been received the truth as to Christ's person would have appeared in its natural place in the manifestation of the gift of life. As it was, in the situation presented to us, the traditional belief in the unique and unapproachable majesty of Jehovah gave rise to a keenly sensitive appreciation of the theological implications of the offer of life, in those who were by their moral temper precluded from accepting the offer. Indeed, the preaching of the Gospel could never have been recorded but that there was present, as witness of the controversy between our Lord and the representatives of the official religion, a disciple who, by a very different moral temper, was enabled to receive it, and who, however little he understood the Gospel of Life at the time it was preached, came, in process of time, and in the light of the Christian experience, to see its significance.

3. The Discourses.

The question as to the historical character of the discourses in which the Gospel to Jerusalem is presented to us is an historical question, with which we are not here attempting to deal. How far they represent discourses actually delivered by our Lord we are not attempting to say. But on the face of it they profess to be recollections of discourses actually delivered, and we may note what would necessarily be the character of such recollections. The whole matter of the book consists of recollections, and of recollections which, if they are recollections of the man to whom they are traditionally referred, were the recollections of an old man, looking back over a long interval of years. The recollections of the old of facts and events recalled from the days of their youth are often singularly detailed and minute. But the recollection of words and ideas, thus transmitted over an interval of years through the medium of another mind, are necessarily coloured by the mind through which they pass. They may embody and preserve isolated sayings, fragmentary utterances, which seem to bear the stamp of the original speaker. But such definite remembered sayings will often be only fragmentary, and the reminiscence of the substance of the discourse of which they formed a part, trustworthy in proportion to the capacity of the reporter for enter-

ing into the mind of the original speaker, will take a shape determined by the mind through which they have passed. In the Fourth Gospel the writer is obviously sometimes professing to present to us his own explanatory comments. Sometimes it is difficult to draw the line between reminiscence and comment, and individual remembered sayings appear to stand as isolated recollections without the original connection of thought being supplied. We shall take the discourses as they stand, proceeding on the hypothesis—the only hypothesis on which an inquiry into the substance of the Gospel could be conducted—that the writer intends us to take them as presenting to us the Gospel actually preached by our Lord at Jerusalem.

In what I have said above and in what is to follow it may sometimes seem as if I were dealing with the question of the historical character of the whole story and of the discourses.

I am, in fact, taking the whole record at its face value—*i.e.*, I am proceeding on the hypothesis that events happened as the story represents them to have happened, and that discourses were delivered which are represented by the discourses here given. It is only by proceeding on this hypothesis that we can answer the question which we are setting out to answer, What is the substance of the Gospel represented as preached to Jerusalem ?

But in proceeding on this hypothesis we must make the hypothesis as intelligible as may be. And this means that we must note how the events as represented fit in with the events recorded in the Galilean Gospels. And we must take the discourses recorded, as having the kind of relation to discourses originally delivered which is suggested by the nature of the record itself and by the circumstances under which they must have been originally delivered and subsequently recorded.

Whether the events as recorded do, as a matter of fact, harmonize with the Galilean story is an historical question with which I have attempted to deal elsewhere* and which has been more adequately dealt with, in the same sense, by Dr. Holland and by the Dean of Wells.

Whether, again, our Lord can really be considered to have delivered discourses of which those here given are the representatives, and how far the discourses here given are trustworthy records and reminiscences of such discourses—these are historical questions which remain for subsequent consideration.

* *The Gospel of the Rejection.* Murray, 1905. See also Holland, *The Fourth Gospel,* and the Dean of Wells in lectures reported in *Guardian,* May 19 and 26, 1923. The subject has also been recently dealt with by Dr. Stanton in *The Gospels as Historical Documents,* Part III.

Meanwhile, it is as a step towards such consideration that we make the following attempt to arrive at some answer to the question, What is the Gospel which is here represented as preached to Jerusalem?

WILFRID RICHMOND.

(To be continued.)

THE CHRISTIAN MYSTERY

I.

THE early Christians called their sacraments "mysteries," in part, at least, because they were hidden from all but the initiated. When the Church began to speak Latin, it used the word *sacramentum* as a translation of μυστήριον, not primarily because it means a soldier's oath, but because the ceremony of initiation in other religions—in Mithraism, for example—was called *sacramentum*, from the vow of secrecy, and the other vows, required of the candidate. The association of Christianity with the "mysteries," from the very beginning of the former until it supplanted its rivals and drove them from the field, was peculiarly intimate. All that was vital and religious and popular in Gentile religion during the centuries just before and just after the life of Christ found expression in the mysteries. Their influence was widespread, both in space and time. The greatest and most dignified came from Persia, and has left traces in the far North-West, in the highlands of Scotland![*] Ezekiel refers to the weeping for Tammuz,[†] and the Eleusinian mysteries must have been centuries older than that.[‡] It was not, however, until the third and fourth centuries of our era that the decisive conflict came between Christianity and the religion of Mithra, the greatest of the non-Christian mysteries. Mithraism spread through the Roman Empire from Persia; the Eleusinian mysteries came to Athens, probably from Egypt by way of Crete. Cybele was brought to Rome from Asia Minor. And Syria was also one of the important centres of this type of religion. It is admitted by everybody that the thought and vocabulary of Christians were much influenced by the mysteries. The question can, in fact, be avoided no longer: Was Christianity *from the beginning* one of the mysteries?

It is necessary to state the problem in this somewhat extreme form for more reasons than one. As Schweitzer

* F. Cumont, *The Mysteries of Mithra*, p. 43.

† Ezek. viii. 14. This prophecy dates from about 591 B.C.

‡ They are in the direct descent from that primitive worship of the creative and destructive powers of nature which existed long before Homer.

points out, theological progress takes place when one of two conflicting alternatives is stated in its most extreme form, with all its logical implications and results clearly expressed. Only so can its meaning be fully understood. It may be that the final verdict of theology will be to accept this alternative, but only with many qualifications; or it may reject it entirely, or allow it no more weight than is implied in recognizing one or two important difficulties in rival theories. But the progress of theology is from exaggeration to exaggeration. It is also true that a new theory is not only not accepted, but is attacked and denounced, because theologians are afraid of its results for faith. If Christianity has been affected by the mysteries, its superiority, its exclusive claim to be divine revelation, seem to be imperilled. So theology seems always committed to the policy of stopping its ears and rushing on the new theory. The truth is not easily discovered by such methods. The only brave and scientific thing to do is to see how much can be said for the new hypothesis, and what the result will be for theology if it can substantiate all its claims. It is probable that it will appear that theology will find the new theory quite harmless, and perhaps useful. That, at least, is the method of this essay. Reitzenstein and Bousset suggest that St. Paul preached Christianity as a mystery religion. Let us go all the way with them. Let us go two miles!* Suppose it be true that the Lord Jesus Himself proclaimed a Christian mystery. What does that mean? And if it be truth, what effect would it have on our theory of Catholic faith and practice?

The word "mystery" used to be derived from the verb μύειν—to close the eyes or lips. A vow of secrecy was imposed, and was well kept. In Attica civil penalties were imposed on those who broke the vow.† An atmosphere of awe certainly surrounded all the details of the ceremonies connected with them, although the purpose of the mysteries was quite openly discussed. This derivation was commonly accepted in antiquity, and the verb μύειν comes to mean "to be initiated into the mysteries." But St. Clement of Alexandria gives a hint of another derivation. He alludes scornfully to the filth (μύσος) of Dionysos as proof that the initiates into the mysteries need purification, and Miss Jane Harrison asserts that this shows the original meaning of the word "mysteries." They were essentially ceremonies of initiation, preceded by elaborate ceremonial purifications—purification in order that the worshipper might safely behold and handle and taste certain sacred

* St. Matt. v. 41.

† The death penalty was sometimes enforced. See B. A. G. Fuller, *History of Greek Philosophy*, p. 48.

symbols. "Whoever has not pure hands, whoever has not distinct utterance," said the Archon before the procession set out from Athens to Eleusis, "ought not to assist." There were fasts; those who were to be initiated had to bathe in salt water, and sacrifice a pig, also dipped in the sea. This purification is not primarily concerned with water, but with deliverance from evil spirits. At first, at Eleusis, the right of admission to the mysteries was very jealously guarded, but in time it came to be open to all Greeks who underwent the ceremonial purification. Women were admitted, and children, and slaves, and prostitutes. The mysteries of Mithra were confined to men, but those of Isis and Cybele came to have no bar to initiation except the ceremonial one. This is very important, for it means that the mysteries were the first religions in the western world to be free from local or national or racial conditions. They taught people—by their practice, not by any words—to think of religion as an individual concern, and therefore they prepared the way for a universal religion. The later mysteries, indeed, were universal religions. It is well to realize that these two things always go together. A religion only becomes catholic when it becomes a matter for individual choice—when it separates father from son, and mother from daughter, and daughter-in-law against mother-in-law—when it ignores all distinctions of race and class and wealth and education, and takes a human being as such.

The purifications which prepared the way for the mysteries were ceremonial only; they were in no sense moral. There were even, in the Eleusinian mysteries, many gestures and expressions of sensuality. It would be correct to speak of much that went on—particularly in the public processions which preceded the mysteries—as indecent, if it were not for the religious feeling of the worshippers, which lifted these things on to a different level. Sex and its symbols—life and its awful secret—were present to the subconsciousness of the worshippers. There is no hint anywhere that there was any ethical teaching or moral exhortation in the mysteries. The idea of purity found only ceremonial expression. And yet—and this at first seems surprising—there is universal testimony, among those who have a right to an opinion on the subject, to the real moral effect of the mysteries on those who were initiated.* At least as early as the fifth century B.C. the mysteries had engendered the idea of purity of heart and thought. They meant sacramental union with the divine,

* J. Glasse, *The Mysteries and Christianity*, p. 55.

and men and women could not but be sobered by the thought of that great privilege. People sought to be worthy of their association with Isis, and Mithra called his worshippers to war against wrong. He was the god of truth, and hater of lies.* And it cannot but be true that the pathos and beauty of the story of Demeter and Persephone touched some of the worshippers to a really spiritual response.† We have evidence, indeed, of the degradation of the mysteries.‡ But we should not like the achievement of Catholicism to be judged by the scandalous stories of the moral and religious state of Europe in the fifty years before 1530. People took from the mysteries what they could. Some stopped at formal observance, some got at the inner life and meaning of the whole thing. The mysteries are not the only religion in which the letter killeth and the spirit maketh alive. On the whole, they issued in a re-affirmation of the dignity and seriousness of life. We moderns are, perhaps, too self-conscious about morality, and over-confident of the good results of moralizings and preachings. Perhaps we do not know so much about "the good" as we think we do. This ancient example of the development of the ethical from the merely ceremonial may be a clue to the way in which evolution has taken place, and a suggestion of how fundamental is sacramentalism in the structure of things. If so, it means that our sacramental theory must be very thorough-going if it is adequately to represent the truth.

And after the ceremonial purification, what then? The initiates were admitted to see a symbolic drama which represented the myth of the god. The story of Demeter and Persephone, or of Dionysos, or of Isis and Osiris, was represented in action and in dramatic form. But most of this drama was presented in symbols, which were exhibited and explained to the people. In this drama it may be said that the god was the real actor; it is putting the same truth in another form to say that it was more than a mere drama—it was a ceremonial that was being celebrated. What was done in the presence of the people was intended to affect the god. These ideas do not need elaborating, for they are familiar to us in our celebrations of the Eucharist.

The legend—the myth of the god thus dramatized in symbols—conforms always to one pattern, more or less. It is a story of death and return,§ of suffering and victory, of a dying god

* L. Patterson, *Mithraism and Christianity*, pp. 4, 40.

† B. A. G. Fuller, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

‡ Plato, *Republic*, II. 364 *c*. Legge, *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity*, i., p. 140. Fuller, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

§ "Life out of death is the keynote" of the mysteries. See L. Patterson, *Mithraism and Christianity*, p. 24.

by whose death men are redeemed, feeding on whom they are strengthened with his immortality, of a god who every year is insulted and suffers for the salvation of the world. These are conceptions, also, with which Christians are familiar, so much so that we are accustomed to think of them as characteristic of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. But such thoughts, guesses, hopes, intuitions, were "in the air" throughout the civilized world at the beginning of our era. And the explanation is that in all of the mysteries, and at every stage of them, nature symbolism was very near the surface. The grain of wheat that falls into the ground and dies, and through its death yields much fruit, is the fact that gives rise to the stories of Persephone, and Osiris, and Tammuz. Processes which ever repeat themselves in nature—processes by the repetition of which men live—processes behind which is God—are represented as the movement of the divine life. The mysteries were acted parables of the relation of the life of man to the life of God.

Lastly, the initiate is allowed to handle and taste the divine symbols. He asserts as his own the divine life. There is corporal communion between the worshipper and his god. One of the few details we know of the mysteries of Eleusis is the phrase, uttered by the initiate in a sort of ecstasy, "A kid, I sink into the milk." Another is the phrase, "I am thou, and thou art I." The worshipper of Demeter was identified with the goddess, and participated in her sufferings and in her triumph. In the same way, in the mysteries of Osiris, after baptism the initiate is adored as the god himself. Among the Orphic means of grace was a mystic sacrament, in which the initiated drank the blood or devoured the body of his god, and this had the significance, not only of communion with the god, Dionysus, but of a mystical sacrifice recapitulating his death.* The story of the death of Orpheus, indeed, represents this, for there is no trace of cannibalism in Greece. A principal part of the worship of Mithra consisted of a sacred meal, partaken of in common by the initiates; bread and water were consecrated by a sacred formula, and were believed to be the means of supernatural grace. The legend of the god was a prophetic outline of the spiritual life of his worshipper. The latter was to live over again, with the help of the god—by the grace of the mystery—the experience the god had lived through before him.† In this way the mystery became the assurance of immortality. No other religion had ever dared to promise

* Fuller, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

† The Orphics, indeed, made a direct application of the incidents of the divine story to the details of the moral life.

a life of bliss after death. Only those who have been initiated into the mysteries have hope in the grave. There they have learned the pass words of the other world, the way to propitiate the gods of hell. It cannot be too much emphasized that the ideas of salvation and damnation were novelties in western religion. It is the mystery as the hope of immortality which is at least part of the appeal of Mithraism to the Roman soldier; men in daily peril find that an "other-worldly" religion meets their need. And, again, we notice that what is not directly ethical has an ethical side. For the Orphics were like Immanuel Kant in this, that they were so much occupied with the idea of moral perfection, that they cared for immortality in order to realize it.

It was in this atmosphere and in this environment that St. Paul preached Christianity. "Diana of the Ephesians," who played so large a part in one of the Apostle's adventures, was Demeter—the goddess who founded the Eleusinian mysteries. It is only human to wish that her worshippers had not been quite so eager to burn their books when they were converted to Christianity—students of comparative religion would, to-day, find them worth far more than the fifty thousand pieces of silver at which St. Luke valued them. These mysteries provided a true "preparatio evangelica." Not only had they familiarized men with the notion of a religion which is catholic because it is personal, which emphasizes the importance of personal holiness, and the hope of immortality, but they had to some extent satisfied—and intensified in so doing—the need men felt for fellowship in the days when the world empire of Rome had destroyed and made meaningless all smaller, more local, loyalties. The guilds and clubs of Dionysos and Isis are—equally with the synagogue—the forerunners of the congregations of the Catholic Church. The mysteries made religion seem important to men and women, as any reader of Plutarch or Apuleius can recognize. They believed in the forgiveness of sin. There were daily services, and priests, baptisms and frequent communions, and commendatory prayers for the dying.* They had their virgins, their "experts in chastity," as Tertullian says. The "confessional box" was part of their scheme of salvation.† They knew the distinction between the regular and secular clergy; they had holy water; they were washed in the blood of Mithras's sacrificed bull. Mithraism, in particular, multiplied opportunities for prayer, and motives for piety. Even in the smallest things, the resemblance is marked between Christianity and the mysteries. The priest of Isis dismissed the people

* Arnobius (295 B.C.). Quoted by L. Patterson, *op. cit.*, p. 59.
† F. R. Barry, *Christianity and Psychology*, p. 84.

with the words λαοῖς ἄφεσις—*plebs missa est.* All this is known to, and recognized by, the apologists and Church Fathers. But there is never any suggestion that pagans have plagiarized from Christians—always the definite statement that the devil has by anticipation approximated to the truth of God.* The presumption is overwhelming that St. Paul's most ready listeners included not only those pagans who had been attracted by the spiritual monotheism of Judaism, but those also whose emotions and mind and conscience had been stimulated by the mysteries.

The word "mystery" occurs often in St. Paul's epistles, with many different shades of meaning. Sometimes the word merely means something hard to be understood. In 1 Cor. xiv. 2, "He that speaketh in a tongue . . . (for no man understandeth) . . . in the spirit he speaketh mysteries." Sometimes the meaning of the word is quite indeterminate—*e.g.*, 1 Cor. ii. 7: "We speak God's wisdom in a mystery"—but he leaves the subject before he explains the "content" of this wisdom or this mystery. Since Lightfoot's edition of St. Paul's epistles it has been generally held that he used the word mystery to mean something that was before hidden and is now revealed—a meaning of the word as flatly contrary to its common use as is Bishop Butler's use of the word "revelation." An examination of the passages upon which Lightfoot relies reveals the interesting fact that the "content" of this mystery—once hidden, now revealed—is generally the same—it is that the Gentiles are fellow heirs with the Jews—in other words, it is universalism, the fact that Christianity is a Catholic religion—a point of close resemblance between it and the "mysteries," usually so called. Sometimes the word comes unsought to St. Paul's pen when he is thinking of immortality—*e.g.*, "Neither doth corruption inherit incorruption—ἰδοὺ μυστήριον ὑμῖν λέγω—we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed" (1 Cor. xv. 51). Sometimes the word "mystery" speaks of that union with the divine Lord which is the reality promised, more or less explicitly, by all the mystery religions, as when in the epistle to the Ephesians he says: "The twain shall become one flesh. This mystery is great. But I speak in regard of Christ and of the Church" (Eph. v. 32). Sometimes the two ideas, of immortality and of union with Christ, are joined together by the word "mystery," as in Col. i. 26, 27. "This mystery, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory"—a phrase which exactly sums up the attitude of the mystery religions towards God and destiny. Christ is the mystery of

* A smilar charge seems to have been made against the Christians by the worshippers of Mithra. See Cumont, *op. cit.*, p. v.

God—as in Col. ii. 2. Those who look on Him behold the drama of the life of God set forth in symbol—they who have seen Him have seen the Father (St. John xiv. 8). He is an active expression of the relation of the spirit of man to the Divine basis of the world. "God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself" (2 Cor. v. 19). All this is most explicitly set forth in 1 Tim. iii. 15, 16—a passage which may not be by St. Paul himself, but is most certainly Pauline. A reasonable paraphrase of the passage would run something in this way: "You must know that just as in Greek temples there are set forth symbolic representations of the lives of the gods to whom the temples are dedicated—'the mysteries' of which all your flock have heard, and in which some of them, perhaps, have played a part—so we have our Mystery, to set forth which all Christian communities exist, whose importance is recognized by all; I mean that manifestation of the Godhead which we see in our Lord's life, which is described in the confession-chant which we sing so often:

> "'In human form was Christ revealed,
> By spirit-power was He proved the just one,
> To angels He revealed Himself.
> Among the nations He was proclaimed,
> In the world by faith accepted,
> At last in glory God received Him.'"*

The close affinity between Christianity as St. Paul preached it and the mystery religions is, however, even more clear if we examine what he held about the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion. Baptism is to him a rite of initiation by which the believer is united to Christ and so identified with Him that He lives over again the experience of victory through defeat which was Christ's. "As many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ" (he says to the Galatians),† and to the Romans he writes, "All we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death. We were buried, therefore, with Him through *baptism into death:* that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life."‡ Baptism is the condition *sine qua non* of such identification; it is an effectual sign. Moral change, as Dr. Glasse points out, is the fruit, not the substance, of the new life. So also St. Paul emphasizes the real supernatural results of the Holy Eucharist. The bread is the communion of the Body of Christ; the cup is the communion of His Blood. Christ is eaten by the faithful, just as, according to St. Paul, those who eat meat offered to idols have fellowship with devils (1 Cor. x. 20). Later Judaism knows nothing of

* I owe this paraphrase to the Rev. G. A. Johnston Ross, D.D.
† Gal. iii. 27. ‡ Rom. vi. 3 *ff.*

sacraments, nothing of any communion with God through eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood. But the Hellenistic-Oriental mysteries would make St. Paul's readers quite familiar with such conceptions. So also would it seem natural to them that the Lord Jesus had died a violent death, and had returned to life; that He had assured the salvation of those who were identified with Him through the sacraments. The very point on which St. Paul seems to have come into sharpest conflict with some of those who had been Christians before Him, that all Jewish privileges were abolished, and that the "Man from heaven" was for all the world—that Christianity is a catholic religion—was one which, to St. Paul's contemporaries, would mark it as a mystery religion. St. Paul's emphasis on immortality, assured through the putting on of Christ, belongs to the tradition of the mysteries from the time of Pompey until the end of the Roman Empire.* He boasted that he was all things to all men—to gain them. Without any mental reservations, he could offer to paganism One who realized its hopes, fulfilled its intuition, more adequately than its own gods.

The thesis that St. Paul was only influenced by the mysteries to a very small extent, and that similarities of expression are to be explained by the fact that certain phrases were in the air (just as a modern preacher who knows little biology, and whose thinking is hardly influenced at all by science, will use words like "the survival of the fittest," or "the struggle for existence," or "natural selection"), has been maintained with much force and conviction by two eminent scholars, Dr. A. Schweitzer, the great theologian and missionary, and Professor H. A. A. Kennedy, of New College, Edinburgh. Dr. Schweitzer, of course, interprets all St. Paul's thinking in terms of the "thorough-going eschatology" which he applied, with such revolutionary effect, to the Gospels in his famous book, *The Quest for the Historical Jesus*. This method seems to lead to greater paradoxes in the case of St. Paul than in that of his Master, but there is no need for us to reply to it, as it has been most adequately done by Professor Kennedy.† But when Dr. Kennedy comes to deal with the evidence himself, he is far less satisfactory. He reads the New Testament through the spectacles of Liberal Protestantism. This means, *inter alia*, that he explains away the sacramentalism of St. Paul. He empties the religion of the great Apostle, who made *explicit* the fact that Christianity was not a Jewish sect but a Catholic religion, of all that the historic Church has found in it of mystical union with Christ through external means of grace. His

* Cumont, *Mysteries of Mithra*, p. 31.
† *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, pp. 274 *ff.*

portrait of the Apostle is not historically conceivable. We may grant that in "St. Paul we are confronted, not with one of those natures which is content to be the medium of the spiritual forces of its environment, but with a personality which . . . transforms every influence to which it is sensitive into the freedom born of a triumphant faith."* But that cannot mean, as any unsophisticated reading of the epistles makes abundantly plain, that St. Paul was entirely cut off from his environment, and taught a combination of ethical rationalism with the Lutheran interpretation of justification by faith. It is true that the vital centre of his thinking lies in his conception of faith. "The centrality of faith, therefore, comes to be a criterion of every attempt at reconstructing Paul's spiritual platform."† The question that must be answered, however, but which Professor Kennedy does not so much as ask, is, Why does St. Paul make this saving faith depend on the sacraments? That he believes that the sacraments are essential to salvation no reader of the Epistle to the Romans, or of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, can doubt. That he also believes that the sacraments are not effectual apart from faith, that their action is not magical, but mystical, is also true. But the central place of the sacraments in his system is clear, and makes Paulinism much more akin to the mystery religions than it is to Liberal Protestantism.‡ Much of what Professor Kennedy says of the inherently ethical quality of Paulinism is truly and eloquently said. But on this particular issue it is, strictly, irrelevant. To say that there is much evidence that Christianity is a mystery religion that happened to survive does not mean that it was not superior to its rivals and forerunners. On the contrary, its survival is evidence of its superiority. St. Paul inherited from his Master, and from Judaism, an ethical conception of religion which is part of that superiority which enabled Christianity to survive.

Bishop Gore's contention that Christianity owes nothing to Hellenistic influences in its origins, but only in its later developments, is really countered by all the modern claim that New Testament Christianity is not Protestant, but Catholic. Sacramentalism, the mystical union with Christ, an "otherworldly" religion—these are indeed a root out of a dry ground, if Bishop Gore's contention be true. But they are an example of the orderly working of Divine providence through natural evolution, if St. Paul preached Christianity as a "mystery" to people whose minds moved naturally in that environment.

* Kennedy, *op. cit.*, p. 299. † Pp. 283, 284.

‡ For a piquant and effective criticism of Dr. Kennedy by a fellow-Presbyterian see Glasse, *The Mysteries and Christianity*, pp. 131-140.

The question which has *now* to be faced is, How far was St. Paul original in this? Bishop Gore holds that he was the first to interpret the Lord Jesus as the pre-existent Son of God who had come from heaven and lived and died and rose again for our salvation, and had returned to the Father, but that this interpretation expressed, and found its justification in, our Lord's own words about Himself, and re-emphasized for those who had been Christians before Him some of those words whose meaning they had scarcely grasped. Is it possible that in presenting our Lord to the Gentiles as κυρίος—the Lord of a mystery—one who had shared man's experience of mortality in order that man, united to Him by the sacraments, might share His immortality—is it possible that in this also St. Paul is only re-emphasizing what his Master had said, and making explicit what had been implicit, in the sacramentalism, for example, of the Jerusalem Church before his conversion? The Lord Jesus spoke and thought in terms of Hebrew prophecy. That is admitted by the strictest sect of the orthodox to be consistent with the truth of the Incarnation. The question I want to raise is, Does the evidence suggest that our Lord also spoke and thought in terms of the Gentile mysteries?

Many Liberal writers, both of the Catholic and Protestant wings, seem to see a gulf between St. Paul and the Lord Jesus which, as a matter of fact, is not there. Through every paragraph that St. Paul wrote there breathes his conscious and complete dependence upon the historical Jesus Christ, who had been born, and had died, and had risen again. He boasted that he had "the mind of Christ." He is accepted by those who were apostles before him—not, perhaps, without misgivings—his personality is too strongly marked for men not to ask questions about him—but they give him the right hand of fellowship, they accept him at his own valuation as an apostle of Jesus Christ. It is true that his vocabulary and ways of thinking are widely different from those of the Master, more complex, less unified, tangled with all kinds of discordant emotions and inconsistent thoughts, expressed in logical forms which are out of date. There is excuse for the reader who at first says that Paulinism is a new, a different gospel. But when the Epistles are examined systematically, under the difference of phraseology there is a startling resemblance. This is most obvious between the moral teaching of St. Paul and that of our Lord. Every unsophisticated man recognizes the fresh vitality and originality of the ethics of Jesus. When one comes to examine the matter, one discovers that the ethics of St. Paul are the same. He puts the emphasis where Jesus put it. He has the same belief in freedom, in love, in forgiveness, in purity.

He does not always rise to Christ's level, some things are not so obvious to him as to His Master—but there is no contradiction, there is no *difference*. And if that be so in the realm of practice, it cannot be different in the realm of belief. His Christology shows a development from the position of 1 Thessalonians to the position of Ephesians. The synoptic writers lived through the years of this development, members of the same Church, in one case, at least, the companion of St. Paul. They show their independence, their reliability as historians, by their freedom from St. Paul's characteristic phraseology. But they believed what he believed about Christ, and they saw no inconsistency between the faith they professed and the record they wrote down. That must be the ultimate proof of the agreement between St. Paul's teaching and that of the Lord Jesus. So far as St. Paul's sacramentalism is concerned, he himself was made a Christian by baptism—and one of the accounts makes much of the *opus operatum*, for Ananias said to him: "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins" (Acts xxii. 16). This represents the practice and belief of the primitive community (Acts ii. 38); and St. Paul's own teaching about baptism is in line with it. There is no evidence that the sacrament of the Eucharist was introduced into the Christian community by St. Paul—in fact, all the evidence is the other way (Acts ii. 42, 46)—and St. Paul claims the authority of Christ Himself for it (1 Cor. xi. 23). The presumption, then, is that if St. Paul preached Christianity as a mystery religion, he had warrant for that in the teaching of Jesus Himself. What is the evidence of the gospels on this point?

The marks which indicate the influence of the mysteries, —of Hellenism as distinct from Judaism—are (1) a universal, because a personal—*i.e.*, not a national, religion. (2) Sacraments as effectual means of grace. (3) Corporal communion with God in the Eucharist. (4) The assurance of immortality through such sacramental union with the Divine. If we give any confidence to St. John's Gospel as a record of the actual teaching of the historical Jesus, then these things were part of our Lord's teaching. Neither Jerusalem nor Gerizim is to be the centre of the new religion. Samaritans as well as Jews are appealed to, and believe. He is—the author tells us—the Light *which lighteneth every man*, coming into the world. He is conscious that "the world is His parish"—how else can we explain His deep emotion when Greeks seek him, and are brought to Him, and his words to them: "The hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified"? It is significant, also, that on this, the only occasion on which He is reported to have met Greeks, he should have begun at once to speak of

the seed-corn which falls into the ground and dies and brings forth fruit—significant, because the Eleusinian mysteries were founded by Demeter, the goddess of agriculture—and in those mysteries an ear of wheat was exhibited as a symbol of the myth of Persephone—who went down into the place of death every year, and returned again to the light. According to St. John, our Lord taught that entrance into the kingdom was impossible except through the new birth which comes through water and the Spirit—through baptism, that is to say. He is the Bread of life—and only those who eat His Flesh and drink His Blood have life in themselves, as the Father hath life in Himself, and the son hath life in Himself; and this identification with Christ in Holy Communion is the assurance of immortality. "Whosoever eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood, hath eternal life: and I will raise him up at the last day." Many scholars, of whom Bishop Gore is one, see in the reference of the prologue to the new birth of the Christian a hint that our Lord, in His Virgin Birth, was presenting a pattern picture of the experience through which Christians were to pass, the experience of regeneration by the will of God, a birth from above. And this idea that the divine life was a pattern, an outline beforehand, of what was to be the experience of the believer united to God through the sacraments was, as we have seen, a commonplace of the mystery religions, as it has been of the great Christian mystics throughout the centuries.*

In the Synoptic Gospels everything is more fluid, less definite, than in St. John. Here is the happy hunting-ground of rival theories of Christian origins, however mutually inconsistent they may be. It is enough that we can say that the first three Gospels are patient of interpretation in terms of a mystery religion. They show us a movement which had its centre in Galilee. Our knowledge of religious conditions there at that time is far from full, but we do know that more than one of the mysteries had a foothold in Syria,† and that the Judaism of Galilee was deeply suspect as being tainted with Liberalism. Liberalism meant Gentile influence. And if our Lord had come into contact with the mysteries, much in His teaching is explained which otherwise is a novelty. We do not always realize what a paradox it was that the Jewish Messiah should proclaim the end of all national privilege in religion, and come to found a kingdom of God in which nothing but an ethical religion and a spiritual morality count for anything. His ministry was confined to Palestine; He says explicitly that he was not sent save to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, but He thought in terms of an individualism so much more concrete

* See, *e.g.*, Evelyn Underhill, *The Mystic Way*. † See, *e.g.*, L. Patterson, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

and fundamental than that of Jeremiah and Ezekiel that St. Paul's Catholic mission is the inevitable fruit of such a seed. That our Lord implies this universalism, and does not underline it, is characteristic of His whole method of teaching.* That may be, also, why He makes no reference to Gentile religions, although familiarity with them, on the part of His disciples as well as Himself, is perhaps implied in His telling them that it has been given to them to know the *mysteries* of the kingdom of heaven, significantly, again, in connection with the parable of the wheat which was sown and brought forth much fruit. If He was familiar with the ideas which we have seen to be the commonplaces of the mysteries, we can understand His identification of the suffering servant of Jehovah with the Messiah. This was our Lord's own contribution to the Messianic idea, for there is no trace of it in Judaism before His time. When St. Peter hails Him as Messiah, He at once begins to speak of suffering and death and resurrection, to the complete confusion of His disciple.† The similarity of this whole circle of ideas to the more spiritual interpretations of the nature religions has, of course, struck many readers.‡ And then He makes it clear that the trials of the κυρίος are to be the pattern for the initiate. The disciple is to take up his own cross and follow after Him, and those who so identify themselves with Him here will be assured of identification with Him in the blessed life to come.§ As in the mysteries, the cleavage between the Church and the world is definite. It is to the "little flock" that the Father will, without doubt, give the kingdom, and those who would be Christ's must enter in at the strait gate. They are warned only to give their teaching to the initiate, and to beware of casting their pearls before swine. The Protestant idea that Christianity has any place for salvation outside the Church finds no support in the Synoptic Gospels. That our Lord also says that if a man wants to be initiated—τέλειος—he must sell all that he has, and give it to the poor, and take up his cross, and follow Him,‖ and that not everyone who says, "Lord, Lord" (does this mean not every one who is initiated?) shall enter the kingdom, means that His religion was practical, and His idea of God was moral, through and through. But the sacramentalism implied in the synoptics is as fundamental and central as we have found it in the Fourth Gospel and the Pauline Epistles. John's baptism was "unto repentance" and "into the putting

* I have worked this out in an article in the *Expositor*, for October, 1922.
† St. Mark viii. 27 *ff*.
‡ See, *e.g.*, G. Bernard Shaw, *Androcles and the Lion*, pp. xxi, xxxv, etc.
§ St. Matt. x. 32.
‖ St. Matt. xix. 21; St. Mark x. 31.

away of sins," an effectual means of grace: he was not one for whom preaching was the fundamental thing, and baptism a seal to the preaching, but one for whom baptism was the essential thing, and our Lord gave His authority to that kind of sacramentalism when He was baptized. The accounts of the Last Supper, which are as certainly authentic as any other part of the Gospels, and can only be rejected for theological reasons, imply the same theory of the sacraments as St. Paul held. "Take, eat. This is My Body. . . . This is My Blood." There is nothing like this in Judaism. The religion which our Lord taught was in some ways startlingly like the mysteries which it supplanted.

To a thorough-going evolutionist, of course, the fact that Christianity survived is itself an indication that it met man's real need, and a sign that it expressed the truth of God (the two things are surely correlative!) more completely than the pagan mysteries could do. It triumphed because Jesus was an historical person. He was human, more real, nearer the heart, than a personified myth like Mithra or Osiris. Christianity had a more complete identification with morality,* a more ethical and, therefore, more satisfying doctrine of God; it was ultimately more reasonable. It was more human than the noblest of its rivals, for Mithraism had no place for women and children. Its very bigotry saved it. It would not compromise. It was war to the death between it and its rivals, and it did not die.

The pagan mysteries witnessed to the needs of the heart. They had taught men that religion is a serious reality in human life, and they had made religion a universal, an individual thing. They had quickened in man the sense of sin, and then made him seek, not to become indifferent to sin, but to be delivered from sin. They speak of man's craving for fellowship with a God who has known human life from the inside,† his craving for a confirmation of the hope of immortality. They had hinted that matter is the lamp of the spiritual, the moral, the divine, the eternal—the channel of invisible things. Either all these religions—which lifted man's eyes heavenwards for a thousand years—either they are a great unanswered prayer of the heart of man, a cry to an indifferent heaven, or that prayer is answered in Christ.

It has been said that the intoning of Matins and Evensong which is so edifying in "places where they sing" is a survival of the monotonous chant with which savages dance round

* Even in Mithraism there is nothing like Christ's second commandment. And "Love your enemies" is unique in the ancient world.

† Who, unlike Zeus, knows the meaning of the word "alas." See Æschylus, *Prometheus Bound*, l. 980.

their idol. Catholicism is the form of Christianity which is proud of that continuity. The Christian faith is the crown of the great tree of human religion. The promises of God, as they are expressed in the ideals, and guesses, and intuitions of the human race, are " yea " and " amen " in Christ. He is the divine interpretation of the hopes and terrors, the prayers and dreams and duties which make up the history of human religion.

A. E. Baker.

(To be continued).

THE REVISION OF CANON LAW*

Probably no one will desire to dissociate himself from the intention that underlies the Commission from the Church Assembly which is to deal with the existing Ecclesiastical Courts so as to make them what they are not now—acceptable to all Churchmen—and to produce peace.

But however satisfactory the work of that Commission may prove, even if their Revised Courts should seem ideal to all Churchmen, the mere Revision of the Courts, by making them accessible to many who at present refuse to use them, will not reduce the number of cases (indeed, the cases will probably be multiplied), will not meet the present difficulty at all, and will not give us peace.

If one considers how the parochial clergy have objected to the Education Acts of the last fifty years and the way those Acts have been run to the exploitation and penalization of our Church, and also considers how the parochial clergy have obeyed the Law because they knew that it was the Law; if one considers how the parochial clergy who happen to draw their incomes from T.R.C. have lost in income £9,000,000 in the three years 1919, 1920, 1921, and yet in spite of its injustice, in spite of the unauthorized and unconstitutional way in which their assent was assumed, have submitted to that loss because they knew it was the Law—if we consider these things alone, it seems contrary to evidence to say that as a class the clergy are " lawless."

Why, then, are the clergy called " lawless " ?

Because they, and others, do not know what the Ecclesiastical Law is. In other words, they obey the Civil Law because they know it, but not the Ecclesiastical Law because it is not knowable. If any incumbent and his Bishop hold

* Speech delivered in the Lower House of Convocation of the Province of York, February, 1924, by the Rev. J. V. Bullard, M.A., Proctor for the Archdeaconry of Richmond.

different views about Ecclesiastical Law each can produce a respectable body of ecclesiastical lawyers and precedents to support the view he holds: while the Law itself can nowhere be found explicitly set forth by authority in such terms as the man whom it concerns can understand.

But, as a matter of impartial comment from one who has never been concerned in such a position, it is obvious that it would be just as fair, when such a difference exists, for the incumbent to call his Bishop "lawless" as for the Bishop to call his priest "lawless." It is a pleasure to note that good manners restrain most of those directly concerned from the personality.

The really lawless people are the unfortunate Chancellors who have with their *discretion* to make up for the indefiniteness and non-existence, or, at any rate, non-expression or non-publication, of the Law.

Surely any reasonable man—we all mean ourselves by the phrase, of course—can see that if the Law were so stated there would be practically no work for the Courts; for men would either obey the Law or would not be ordained into Holy Orders, or, being laymen, would likewise obey the Law or leave the Church.

That is the first and greatest argument in favour of a revision of Canon and Ecclesiastical Law at the present time.

We should be a house not divided against itself.

But there is a further reason why the Revision of the Courts is wholly inadequate. It has in view the enforcement of discipline on the parochial clergy, as the Bishop of Durham has indicated. But the Church consists also of Bishops and laity.

Some, at least, of the troubles in parishes arise from Bishops. I know a case of a middle-aged farmer on the point of being confirmed after long years of preparation. When he read in the Diocesan Gazette a speech by the Bishop in which he said he knew "many loyal members in the Church who had never been confirmed," the farmer promptly refused confirmation and never joined the Church at all. He is now dead. But confirmation has been seriously checked in the parish.

I know a case where a man married his deceased wife's sister contrary to Canon Law and was suspended from Communion and reported to the Bishop. Under the rubric "the Ordinary SHALL proceed against the offending person according to the Canon."

But the Ordinary did nothing.

It is things like this that upset a parish and discount the parish priest's position.

Again, if the Courts only are to be dealt with and the Law left where it is, the *laity* will be left with the controlling power

assigned to them by the Enabling Act and other Acts promoted by the Church Assembly, but discharged from ecclesiastical discipline. The current text-books on Ecclesiastical Law make this clear—*e.g.*, Cripps's *Law Relating to Church and Clergy* (7th Edition, p. 25) lays it down that Canon Law does not bind the laity.

The statement comes from a lawyer universally respected who also desires that Ecclesiastical Laws shall be set forth in such terms that those whom they concern can understand them without technical training. We have all heard him say so more than once.

For these reasons the statement deserves careful consideration. It is based on a "dubious middle," a confusion between "laity" as meaning lay members of the Church of England and "laity" as meaning the whole people of this land except the ordained. This is apparent from the passage quoted by Cripps from Lord Hardwicke:

"Nothing is so undoubtedly sure as that no new laws can be made to bind THE WHOLE PEOPLE OF THIS LAND but by the King with the advice and consent of both houses of Parliament and by their united authority."

The second reason given by Cripps and also alleged in Hardwicke is that the consent of Parliament was not given to the Canons of 1604, but only the Royal Assent.

Yet pages 99, 100, and 101 of the same work leave the impression that the Crown appoints Bishops because the Crown adequately represents the laity. Moreover, Canon 140 of 1604 (which Cripps accepts) expressly condemns this opinion. But apart from criticism and coming to facts . . . if the Canons of 1604 do not bind the laity, why do so many of them concern the laity? Were all schoolmasters in 1604 in Holy Orders? Were laymen at liberty to marry their grandmothers or deceased wife's sisters and only the clergy forbidden to do so by Canon 99? If so, why was the Deceased Wife's Sister Act necessary?

Was Lyndewood entirely wrong when he wrote:*

"It is certain that a Constitution issued by the Archbishop in a Provincial Council binds ALL in the Province."

Moreover, if the reason alleged for not binding the laity is valid, the same reason would release the Clergy of the Northern Province who were not consulted.

Another reason given by Cripps (p. 3) is:

"What touches all ought to be dealt with by all and have their approval."†

* Lib. 5, tit. 5, De Haereticis Provincialibus. "Certum est quod constitutio edita per Archiepiscopum in Concilio Provinciali ligat omnes de Provincia."

† "Quod omnes tangit, ab omnibus tractari et approbari debet."

Quite so, but only eight lines lower down the King's Power of Assent is stated to be a power derived to him from the WHOLE body of the realm. If the Latin maxim in this place is to be taken to mean that each class must separately be consulted in order to justify "ought to be dealt with by all and have their approval," then why are the clergy not consulted when T.R.C. Bills and others are passed; why are not PAROCHIAL clergy, at least, represented on the present Courts Commission, but only the officials and executioners?

At any rate, whatever Law or discipline there may be in the Church it must apply all round. Neither Bishops nor laity can be omitted, because, as John Peccham's Canon *Plures Invenimus* says:

"That part of a thing is bad which does not match the whole to which it belongs."*

At this point the question is always asked, Why are Canon Law and Ecclesiastical Law in this condition of being unknown or unknowable. The answer is as follows:

Henry VIII. set out to reform the Church in certain ways. In his eyes the monks were superfluous clergy who would be better employed in productive labour. He therefore desired to suppress the monastic orders. But he wished to retain those of their activities which he regarded as beneficial. The monastery schools were to become King's Schools. The corrodies or pensions for founder's kin were to provide almshouses. The scriptoria were to be represented by benefactions to the Universities and by a seminary for Ministers of State. (This fell through.) The monastery churches where necessary were to become parish churches or cathedrals. A good many of the abbeys were to provide for the establishment of new bishoprics and chapters. A good many of these things Henry actually accomplished in his lifetime. Six of the bishoprics were set up. The churches that were not wanted were pulled down or left to crumble.

But before he could produce this reorganization of the resources of the Church, Henry VIII. had to face the then Canon Law, which regarded his projects as sacrilege.

By the suppression of all study of Canon Law at the Universities Henry got rid of Canonist lawyers.

By the submission of the Clergy Act, 1534, he practically got rid of the Canon Law itself.

Under this Act thirty-two persons to be appointed by His Majesty were to determine (i.) *what Canon Law was to be abolished* "as prejudicial to the King's prerogative royal and

* "Turpis est pars quae non convenit suo toto" (L. P., p. 118).

repugnant to the laws and statutes of this realm," and (ii.) *what Canon Law was to be retained.*

As a matter of fact Henry VIII. never did appoint the thirty-two Commissioners. But the Act encouraged the *neglect of the whole* of the Canon Law, since what was to be retained was not settled.

Burnet (*Hist. Ref.*, part i., book iii., p. 271, in the Oxford Edition, 1816) says the delay was intentional. Referring to the last clause of the 1534 Act he says:

> " This proviso seemed to have a fair colour, that there might still be some canons in force to govern the Church by; but since there was no day prefixed to the determination of the Commission, this proviso made that the Act never took effect; for now it lay in the prerogative, and in the judge's breast, to declare what canons were contrary to the laws, or the rights of the Crown: and it was judged *more for the King's greatness to keep the matter undetermined* than to make such a collection of ecclesiastical laws as should be fixed and unmoveable."

Only after fifteen years were thirty-two persons appointed under 3 and 4 Edward VI., chapter xi., which notes the general ignorance about Ecclesiastical Courts and Laws which resulted from this interval in which they had been actually in disuse, the last clause notwithstanding:

> " Albeit the King's most excellent Majesty, Governor and Ruler under God of this Realm, ought most justly to have the government of his subjects and the determination of their causes as well ecclesiastical and temporal, yet the same as concerning having *not of long time been put in use*, nor exercised, by reason of the usurped authority of the Bishop of Rome, *be not perfectly understood nor known of his subjects*, and therefore of necessity, as well for the abolishing and putting into utter oblivion the said usurped authority, as for the necessary administration of justice to his loving subjects" (Then follows the appointment of thirty-two Commissioners).

The Bishops opposed the Act. But it was passed. The Lord Chancellor made out the Commission. The Commission produced the Reformatio Legum. The Reformatio Legum has never had canonical authority. The 1571 Canons did not receive the Queen's Assent. The 1604 Canons and Constitutions were drawn up by Canterbury Convocation and ratified by the King before York Convocation was even formally consulted. York did eventually consent—but under duresse.

Consequently the question is still open whether we have any Canon Law at all, or, if we have, what it is.

The Revision of the Courts without the publication of the Law is a partial reform, marked by partiality.

So far I have given from the parochial and historical points of view practical and presently pressing reasons for the Revision

and Publication of Ecclesiastical Law. But there are other reasons no less pressing because their incidence is spread over the whole Church.

Whatever we may think of the 1534 Act of the Submission of the Clergy, what it did is clear.

The old Canon Law was to remain *except so far as it was counter to the Royal Prerogative and the Statute Law of the realm* until it was revised in a certain way—which has not yet been done.

Consequently, we must know what the Canon Law was prior to 1534 and what the Royal Prerogative was at that date. What the Statute Law of the realm was then is, of course, familiar.

> "Prerogative is the law which peculiarly concerns the Crown and is not different in kind from any other branch of Law" (Selden, *Table Talk*, "Prerogative").

Locke, the philosopher, seems to think Prerogative covers something mysterious, yet regards it as controlled by the rule that it must be employed in good faith for the public advantage. (See Sir Frederick Pollock in *The History of the Science of Politics,"* p. 74.)

The Canon Law prior to 1534 is rather a large subject, but it is quite definite. Some of our troubles arise from the way in which Royal and Archiepiscopal Prerogatives have been invented since 1534 by Ecclesiastical and Crown lawyers.

When Edward I. wanted to tax the clergy for civil and national purposes he wisely consulted them and used the existing Convocations as the means of doing so. But that did not take away the Archbishop's power and right of summoning a provincial synod for the business of the Church, which we are now told is exclusively a Royal Prerogative. The exclusion of the Archbishop's right is a modern invention.

Let us take evidence on the point.

Cripps, 7th Edition, p. 6 :

> "In virtue of his authority as supreme head of the Church, the Sovereign convenes, prorogues, restrains, regulates and dissolves all ecclesiastical synods or convocations. This was an inherent prerogative of the Crown long before the time of Henry VIII. as appears by the Statute 8, Henry VI., Cap. i., and the other authorities vouched by Sir Edward Coke: and would be besides, sufficiently evident from the nature and origin of convocation."

This is theory. The *facts* are as follows:

In the year 325 the Council of Nicea (5th canon) ordered that provincial synods should meet twice a year.

In 673 the first English synod held at Hertford under Archbishop Theodore adopted the rule with the modification that once a year would be sufficient.

In 696 there was the synod at Berkhampstead.

In 1066 provincial synods exercised jurisdiction in certain cases—*e.g.*, disputes between dioceses.

In 1225 a provincial synod was summoned by Archbishop Langton; in 1283 by Archbishop Peckham.

In all this, where is the King ?

It was not until Edward I.'s reign that the provincial synod became part of the constitution of the country *for purposes of taxation*, but it had been part of the constitution of the Church long before.

The statute of Henry VI. proves exactly the opposite to the statement in Cripps:

> " Statuit quod vocandi in futurum ad convocationem cleri *prætextu brevis regii* eadem libertate gaudeant," etc.

Hereby freedom from arrest was granted to the clergy on their way to Convocation only when summoned by the King (for purposes of taxation). The freedom from arrest was not granted when they travelled on merely ecclesiastical business summoned by the Archbishop and Bishop. That this happened is shown by Surtees Society, vol. cxiii., p. 49, where the Archbishop summons Convocation in 1311 to deal with the Templars. The King is not mentioned in the document, nor would he touch the Templar scandal.

The Statute 4 Henry IV., cap. 3, implies that the Archbishop will summon his provincial synod *on his own initiative before* the next parliament, 1402.

In 1433 William Lyndewood had just come back from an embassy to Spain. He had been frequently employed in embassies. He was Keeper of the Privy Seal and Dean of the Court of Arches under his patron, Archbishop Chichele, who was also Lord Chancellor and one of the most powerful and conspicuous figures in the international politics of the period. It is not easy to think of any person who would be more likely to insist on Royal Prerogative.

Yet this is what Lyndewood says in the *Provinciale*, written in 1433, and adopted as authoritative by both Convocations:

> " The Archbishop summons his Provincial Council."*

* " Concilium Provinciale vocat Archiepiscopus." 1505 ed., lib. i., tit. 3. "De consuetudine " v. " synodalis."

And again:

"Archbishops and Bishops can make Constitutions of Common Law which are declaratory and revocatory; and where a penalty is lacking in the Law they can appoint penalties and increase the old penalty. They can also add to Papal Constitutions and fill them out and make Statutes for the correction of Morals which are preceptory, prohibitory and penal."*

There is no word here of the King at all. And if, as some claim, Lyndewood is defining limits between Archbishop and Pope, it comes to the same thing since Henry VIII. took the Pope's place without the assistance of Cardinals, and this passage for provincial business leaves the province paramount.

There can hardly be any doubt on the point, for in a note on a constitution of Archbishop Boniface, "Item statuimus quod Episcopi in suis Synodis," Lyndewood says:

"Note that regularly these possessive pronouns *meum, tuum, suum* signify 'dominium.'"†

If that evidence is carefully considered I think the Royal Prerogative of exclusively calling and dismissing Convocation is shown to be an invention since 1534, when that right was inherent in Archbishops as one of the liberties of the Church constantly reaffirmed in the Statute Laws of the realm from reign to reign. I think it is shown that such Royal Prerogative is no longer justified, since clergy are not now summoned in order to tax themselves.

It certainly is a great inconvenience to us to have our business disturbed and all the bother of a proctorial election because there is a change in the academic opinions of the uninformed.

For the Crown to restore to the Archbishop the usurped authority of summoning Convocation for Church business independently of Parliament would not alter the constitution nor involve disestablishment. The Church was never more established than when Chichele was Archbishop and had that power.

On the other hand, the picture of the Archbishop in Lyndewood is not like that of the uncontrolled autocrat who gave away the right of the clergy to tax themselves in Convocation

* De majoritate et obedientia v juramento lib. folio 37, 1535. Possunt Archiepiscopi et Episcopi Constitutiones facere juris communis—declaratorias et revocatorias et ubi peona deficit in jure possunt peonas apponere et veterem poenam augere. Possunt etiam constitutionibus papalibus addere et eas supplere et ad correctionem morum statuta facere praeceptoria prohibitioria et poenalia.

These Preceptory Constitutions are not abrogated by disuse. *De Constit.*, ch. 1, v. mandamus, p. viii, 1505; v. praecipimus, p. vii.

† "Nota quod regulariter haec pronomina possessiva meum tuum suum Dominium significant," p. 35, 1505 ed.; p. 68, 1679 ed.

(which the Crown had recognized as their constitutional right), and did so without even consulting them; nor like others who gave away the incomes of the clergy without their consent in 1918 and have acted for the Church on their own initiative before and since.

It is true that in Ollard and Crosse, Lyndewood is said to represent the Archbishop as being constitutionally something such an autocrat, and I have no doubt that their Graces have been so advised.

Ollard and Crosse use these words:

"He (Lyndwood) constantly speaks of the Archbishop's Legislative Power and not of that of the Provincial Council."

But anyone who reads Lyndewood for himself will find quite a different story.

I take a few passages hit upon at one random opening of the book and consecutive pages:

Page 63: "This Sacred Council approving we make a statute and lay down a precept."

Page 68: "By the approval of this Council we make a statute."

Page 69: "We make a statute and this Sacred Council approving we strictly inhibit."

Page 69: "We make a decree according to the form of a General Council."

Page 72: "This Sacred Council approving we make a statute."

Page 76: "By the authority of the present Council we considered that we ought to make a statute."*

If a man is going to use those passages to prove the autocracy of the Archbishop who gave his assent to the legislation of the Provincial Synod, the same man will also quote the consent of the two Houses of Parliament to prove the autocracy of the Crown and the absence of any need to consult Parliament.

The biggest concession I have found in Lyndewood is on p. 79:

"It is true that to the Provincial Council the Bishops must be called and not others of necessity."†

"But if others come they must be admitted."

"There will also be summoned others whose actions are in question or because their personal advice is necessary."

* Page 63: Hoc sacre approbante concilio statuimus et precipimus. Page 63: Hujus approbatione concilii statuimus. Page 69: Statuimus et sacro approbante consilio districtius inhibemus. Page 69: Decernimus juxta formam concilii generalis. Page 72: Sacro approbante consilio statuimus. Page 76: Presentis consilii auctoritate duximus statuendum.

† 1st column, Provinciali Synodo, p. 79, 1505 ed. Verum est quod ad Provinciale Concilium vocandi sunt. Episcopi et non alii de necessitate. Si tamen alii veniant admittendi sunt. Vocabuntur etiam alii de quorum factis agitur vel quia ipsorum consilium est necessarium.

On the constitutional points of the relation of the Crown to Convocation and of the extent to which those whose property is being dealt with can be ignored, it would be well to arrive at some decision definitely and clearly stated, our troubles apparently arising out of the arbitrary discretion of Chancellors and their inventions about what is covered by Prerogative in 1534.

To conclude:

1. We submitted to the Crown in 1534 upon a promise of Reform.

We want that Reform to be carried out.

It was bad faith then, it is bad faith still, of the Crown to expect our submission while the bargain remains unfulfilled.

2. We want the Ecclesiastical Law clearly stated so that he who runs may read.

3. We want the same Law in all dioceses by authority.

4. We want our constitutional relation to the Crown defined.

5. We want the discretion of Chancellors curtailed of recent usurpations.

6. We want discipline to be applicable to all.

And we claim these things to be restored as being ours by History, by Constitution, by Law, by Common Sense and by the needs of our Parishes; and we claim these things NOW because the Revision of the Courts without the publication of the Law which these Courts are to administer will not produce the peace we want.

J. V. BULLARD.

THE PARISH

IN a recent article (September, 1923) I discussed the state of religion. Before going on I summarize here the conclusions already reached.

It is admitted that our state is unsatisfactory. Naturally enough, it is said to be the fault of the clergy. I demurred to that, but, fault or none, it is for the clergy to find a remedy. What we have to grapple with is not so much failure as the narrow limits to our success. We do succeed with a certain number—those naturally interested in religion. Beyond these are the laity proper, primarily concerned with secular callings. They are as dear to God as we are, and their calling is given them of God. They have not very much interest in religion, as we understand it, but they stand in as much need of faith, and they find believing in God just about as difficult as we do, though for different reasons.

Our failure is with the laity. As things are, religion is the religion of the religious. The two classes drift increasingly apart. Before we look for remedies, let us ask how this situation has come about. Where are we to look ?

We all know that we are more influenced by men's habitual conduct than by the theories or principles which they put forward, and, perhaps quite honestly, themselves hold. We know also how much a man's own character is moulded by his conduct, often in spite of his principles. Every honest politician—and there are more than folks think—believes himself to be seeking the good of England. They may scoff at votes and parties, but they cannot get away from the fact that the whole system they are working turns on a party success won by votes. A few great statesmen can and do—though only in part—escape the influence of the system. Of the ordinary politician I will add, he is more enslaved to it when he is least conscious of its contradiction.

Now the clergy are drawn from the religious class, and religion is their professional business. The difference of outlook makes a difficulty in their ever quite understanding the mind of the layman, but it also determines the kind and the measure of the help they can give him. The laicized priest is no help to anyone. Our trouble just now, however, is over a difference which has grown into an alienation. I believe the reason of this alienation does not lie at all in the minds of the clergy as a class. We are, indeed, not too much, but if anything too little, professional. It lies in the parochial system, in the form we know it, accept it, and have to use it.

On the parochial system, all the normal religious work is done. I want to point out that it is fundamentally an individual system. The whole area of the country has been divided up into parishes, assigned one to each man. Of the vicar's responsibility there are certain qualifications. The Parish Council may modify his autocracy. There may be an assistant-priest, but he is generally a young man, appointed by the incumbent, hoping for a parish of his own. The authority of the Bishop is a more serious qualification, but the vast size of our dioceses puts him out of all contact with the daily work. He may exercise a certain influence, but his authority can only be an interference with a procedure otherwise determined. Certain kinds of work, also, are, by necessity, extra-parochial—navvies, school-chapels, retreat houses.

These, however, are not more than qualifications. The substance of the matter is that the incumbent is left alone and free to do what he can in his own sphere. It is so in fact; it is so in law; above all, it is so in mind—*i.e.*, we all think

of it this way. The laity habitually talk and think of the vicar as an individual, according to the measure of his individual character and ability. We onlookers talk of the clergy in general as a number of individuals. The parish priest thinks of "his" parish, and *his* people; he knows he has only his own personal devotion, energy, resource, ideas, to trust to. Success will be *his* success, and failure will be *his* failure.

Let us follow this system out, and see the effects it produces under normal circumstances, for I am afraid we are all apt to be misled by the magnificent results some have achieved. Life is not a melodrama of great heroes. Its pathos is in the struggle of commonplace folk to make good in jobs for which our faculties are none too adequate. The parish clergy are astonishingly brave and patient, but they are in an impossible position.

(i.) Let us take these key phrases—his parish, his people, his success—and see what they actually mean to the vicar. The parish is his legally, but his actual power over it is limited to some technical rights of marriage, and the like. The people are his—if he can win them. What are his really are the church buildings and services, together with the parochial organizations. The latter—clubs and meetings, Sunday schools and scouts—count for something, but they are felt to be nothing more than means. Of any one of them, of the Football Club, even of the parish visiting, the question constantly asked is, Does it bring people to Church? By his communicants, confirmation candidates, penitents, and congregations, others will measure, the vicar himself will measure, his success or failure.

The clergy are quite aware that the only true end is a whole-hearted service of God in faith, hope, and love. Church-going is, in the first place, only a means or way of learning the love of God. Secondly, although common worship, especially Communion, is so far a necessity of Christian life that it can serve as a rough test, the real attainment cannot be measured at all. If religious practices are a test, the amount and kind of prayer a man uses in private for himself would be a better one, because they are less of a form.

Unfortunately to the parish priest, the parish services are the only teaching commonly available. "I tell my people that coming to Church is quite secondary to the love of God," but even that he can only preach to those who will come and listen. His real success is hidden from his eyes. It is not an error in the priest's mind, it is the practical result of his position, that the priest's energy and attention are absorbed, the whole parish system is directed, towards the production of

religious observances, and that type of observances which takes place in Church. The children's service counts to the vicar; the children's prayers at night don't. Confessions are heard in Church, and penitents count. Bible reading is done at home, and doesn't count. And the practical system affects people's minds much more than occasional sermons. It also affects the priest's mind more than he is aware; as with politicians, it affects his mind all the more because he isn't aware of it.

This stress on observances, especially on the formal Church observances, is not unnatural to the religious. Perhaps all the more it is not good for them. It sets things in the wrong order just where they are most liable to go wrong. To the ordinary laity it is utterly perplexing. If they are to be got to move at all, they must be taken straight to the centre of things—to faith in God Himself.

(ii.) The appeal of the parson is fundamentally the appeal of the individual—largely a matter of personal influence, emphatically the enunciation of a personal outlook. I have even heard a Bishop say, "The man must be more than his priesthood." I have heard many people say, "The greatest thing you have to give is your personality." These are exaggerated, even absurd, expressions. We may resent them. We have repeatedly warned our people against coming to Church for the parson's sake. Some of us insist carefully that we are not giving our own ideas, but the teaching of the Bible (or of the Catholic Church).

Such protests may be a duty, but they cannot be very effective. So far as preaching is concerned, it is a small point—the laity know well that the parish priest cannot give the Bible and Catholic Truth, but only his own version thereof. If he is very emphatic, then he is probably giving "what the fathers (of his own party) have gathered out of the same."

But the vicar's position and the system are altogether too much both for him and for his people. First, he is an individual. He can only influence those who are open to individual influence, and can be influenced as individuals—first the children; next women; thirdly, a few men of the middle and educated classes. Secondly, as a parson, he can only reach those who respond to his religionist way of looking at life.

The labour-class he can hardly reach at all, for they normally think as a class, not as individuals, and they are very suspicious of individual views. They have emphatic opinions about parsons as another and alien class, though ready to be good-temperedly tolerant of their own vicar as a specimen.

These difficulties explain the extraordinary "lure of the young." Children are very susceptible to personal influence—

so temptingly affectionate, so ready to learn and follow. If you love them, you can do anything with them—so long as they are young. In the eighties we all thrilled to the cry—"the children are with us." They are grandfathers now. The children are "still with us," but the grandfathers are not. I know nothing more pathetic than the words of a priest, singularly successful with young men—"I do not know why, but they all leave me." It is a very dangerous illusion. Children, boys, young men—as each age passes to the next, they do not let slip, they resent, the influence which was exercised upon them.

(iii.) Our parochial system, then, expects the vicar to achieve *his* success in *his* parish with *his* people. Apart from any other criticisms, it is impossible, for the system is false to the facts.

(*a*) In the country, the parish is still a real unit of life, though even here the young mostly go away. But the town parish is little more than a camping ground. The upper classes are relatively stable, but they go where they like. A house agent gave the average tenancy of the working classes at just under nine months (this was probably before the War).

(*b*) Under these circumstances, it is impossible that they should ever be A people at all. For effective purposes "his" people can only be a "gathered congregation." There is a nucleus of the specifically religious, from whom he hopes to work. The larger part consists of more normal laity, whom he hopes to build up, but they are not at all inclined to be built up in the way he thinks. He sighs over the dogged English Protestantism, materialism, unbelief, or something, but the fact is they never do belong to him. Their minds are made in the city, in the workshops and offices. If anyone will compare the parish magazine with the secular newspapers—no doubt, it is a very unfair comparison—he will see, at least, what the difference is. If the laity come to church, it is because they feel something missing in their lives, which newspapers and workshops cannot supply. If they continue coming, it will be because they find somewhere that which they can fit to their own needs. The vicar may be helping them more than he or they think, but it will never be quite in the way he thinks.

(iv.) The true end of all our work is the solid attachment our people have gained to the things of God. A good test will be in the readiness of any one of them to carry on wherever he may find himself. The worst effect of our parochial system is that "religion," in fact, becomes for very many identical with the particular parish church. It has been repeatedly noted in the colonies that our Anglicans have less idea of keeping

their feet than the members of any other denomination. It was noted equally in the War what little hold our own system had on our own men when they got away from their customary surroundings.

But it is equally plain in our own circle. The system of commendation is a simple test, and, broadly speaking, it is of no use at all. If members of our inner circle go to another town, they will look round for themselves to find a parish of their own colour. Of the average Churchgoer, I would not say that he forthwith drops all that he has gained, but the change does create an entirely new situation in which it is quite uncertain whether he will begin again or lapse. In the poorer classes it is not at all unknown to make a point of honour of not attending any Church except their own.

This excessive stress on the individual influence of the vicar, the consequent stressing of religious observances (especially those within his Church) rather than the vital faith in God, the perplexity and alienation of the laity, are not primarily due to the clergy, but to the parochial system they are expected, and are trying, to work. Yet the system has so moulded their minds that they can hardly think at all except in terms of parish activities. I have often talked questions over with them, but for answer there are two initial formulæ: "Yes. Now in my parish . . .;" or, "Yes. I often tell my people . . ."

The parish system is, of course, very old, but this intensely individualized parochialism is purely nineteenth century. There were always cases of the same kind of thing, but the idea of it is now so universal and habitual that the incongruity of it never strikes us. In the army, and in a bank, personal ability is a big asset, but no colonel and no branch manager would dream of having the free hand every vicar expects and gets.

Here is an analogy with a difference. If in the War a company commander lost touch with his adjoining sectors, and the Germans filtered through, the bill would come in to him before the morning was out. In the Church, each vicar carries on a private war with his own opposite number. He is very busy in his own sector, and there is no practical contact with the neighbouring parishes. But the swift urgencies of war are here lacking. The vicar may spend a busy lifetime without recognizing how other ideas are soaking in and without knowing why his men keep dropping.

The spirit of our parochialism is due, no doubt, to the over-developed cult of personality, but its development has been aided by three assistant causes.

The first is legal. Politicians and their lawyers have care-

fully built up a system of sole responsibilities, and, by isolating each man independently, they quite deliberately reduced all to powerlessness. The rector-vicar can do virtually what he likes within the sacred hedge of his parish, and nothing outside it. But then there is nothing strictly inside his hedge except his little parochialities. The Bishop has sole authority over diocesan affairs and Church policy. And, just because he is sole, his power also is stultified. There can be no effective common action without a common mind, and there can be no common mind when habitual action is carried on in habitual isolation.

The second is our own organization, without which the legal system would be merely a paper hoop to jump through. To his clergy the Bishop represents the unity of the Church. I have referred to the size of our dioceses. I have seen it said somewhere that our ideal should be a diocese of 100 parishes. Let us take this ideal, which we are very far off reaching. A hundred parishes!

In the army, after eight years, I believe, a lieutenant becomes a captain—as after a similar period the curate may be hoping to become a vicar. Four companies make a battalion with a colonel, two majors, and an adjutant. Four battalions make a brigade with a brigade staff. Two brigades make a division, and two divisions make a corps, with divisional staffs and a corps staff. The corps commander has, therefore, 64 infantry captains under him. However, the corps may have a third division, or special corps troops, attached, so we may give it a total of 100 company commands, as the ideal Bishop is to have 100 parishes. But between the corps commander and his companies are 3 divisional generals, 6 brigadiers, and 24 colonels; between the Bishop and his parishes there is nothing at all.

"The military analogy does not apply." Let us try sport. The largest team that ever plays together, so far as I know, is a Rugby 15, and that is subdivided into four lines of play. 100 independent parish priests carry one back to the "big-side football" of *Tom Brown*. But the diversity of ages, sizes, skill, ideas, among 100 boys, who at least belong to the same school, know one another, and are accustomed to obey their seniors, is a trifle to the differences between 100 vicars. No team play is possible on such terms. Yet as things stand to-day we are a long way off the 100-parish ideal. Many dioceses have 200 or 300 parishes.

The Bishop is a father in God. If I may say it without impertinence, all the Bishops I ever had to work with were fatherly in an extraordinary degree. But no personal father-

liness can make an effective family out of 100 children. The Bishop is a father, but he can only act as an inspector. He may be a fatherly inspector, but he does not live with his children.

The third cause of parochial separation is our theological differences. Whatever might happen if we were better agreed, no real co-operation is possible under the present circumstances.

No sane person can doubt that our unhappy divisions are a great practical evil, but we must be quite clear in the first what place the evil is. It seems to many people obvious—" If one priest is teaching a Zwinglian view of the sacraments and another is teaching the Roman view, how can the laity not be puzzled ?" But what exactly is " teaching " ? I have heard of a college—I am ashamed to say a Theological College—where the students were expected in examination to reply to all questions in the terms of their lectures. The thing is a nightmare. In the colleges I have worked in personally, the tutors differed, of course, sometimes widely, sometimes strongly, but each gave the best that was in him. The students are not pullets being crammed for market at an early date. They are men who, like our laity, have got to find their way through life, and want from us all the help we can give them. But that help must be of the nature of principles, such as they can understand and use, not charms which must be repeated exactly.

The truth of God is infinite, universal—*i.e.*, Catholic. The knowledge of man is inadequate, and that of any one man, layman or teacher, is particular, personal, private. This is the very ground of faith, hope, love, the fellowship of the Church. The evil of life is not weakness, nor inadequacy, nor its consequent differences, but the self-satisfaction which resents weakness and inadequacy in others, and ignores them in oneself. Contradictious infallibilism in the teacher may create a similar, but opposed, infallibilism in the layman; it may create an agnosticism, puzzled or indifferent. If the teachers will neither agree nor learn, why should the students ?

As a mere matter of history and fact, our unhappy divisions are the result rather than the cause of parochial isolation. The Puritans provide the first instance, and they entrenched themselves behind the parochial barbed wire. The Wesleyans, evangelicals, ritualists—all did it, and we do it. Every vicar is his own denomination; he is so in fact, and by the whole assumption of his position. In a city I will call Newton there are, according to Crockford, 16 parishes and 27 clergy. What is the Church of Newton ? I can only answer there is none. There are 16 churches. For certain purposes they will co-operate. They have a good deal in common. They do not now quarrel, but in effect each parish goes its own way. The vicar

works by, and develops, his own views and his own methods. Wherever he gets them from, and whatever he calls them, they provide the whole capital, so to speak, by which the Church of this parish is built up. Then we plead that we cannot work together because we differ. In plain fact we differ and go on differing because we do not work together. Each is working upon a limited set of notions—his own—and that is the fundamental principle of denominationalism, since no man can have in himself what is necessary for a Church. Religion limps; faith in God is forgotten, not because the clergy are not in earnest, but because the exceeding richness of their earnestness is wasted by individualism.

The question of the Church brings us to the very heart of the problem. Of course I do not for one moment underrate the vital importance of earnestness and devotion in the clergy, but if our assumption were true the Creed ought to run, "I believe in Holy Catholic (or Evangelical) priests." That is what we are thinking, but the Creed does not connect the Catholic Church with the clergy, but with One, Holy and Universal Spirit. These confusions in our work, so baffling, these perversities I have noted so often by which, where we honestly want to put God, love, faith, in the foreground, we yet find we are pushing ourselves, Church-going, our own parishes—does it not all mean that there is something wrong in the very disposition of our thinking and consequent practice? That assumption is leading us all wrong. It is a faith in men, in men's efforts, and not in God.

If this article were a description of our actual position, I think it might reasonably be charged with some exaggeration. My real purpose, however, has been to give a scientific analysis of the operation and effect upon our minds and our work of certain commonly accepted ideas. There have been qualificatory forces at work, some of which I have noted. A growing sense of the futility of much of our methods has brought in a new mind and new methods, of which the division of dioceses, Parochial Councils, Diocesan Finance, and the National Assembly, are the most notable. A certain querulousness, with which they have been met by many of the clergy and Church papers, is a sign of how deeply this spirit of isolation and personal self-sufficiency has eaten into our minds. They will not produce their full effect till they have created in us a new mind. Yet it is not a new mind. It is the faith common to us all, which is longing for escape from its own entanglements and for a more consistent expression. But this I must leave for another opportunity.

HERBERT KELLY, S.S.M.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The Alcuin Club have followed up their proposals for a revised Liturgy with a further "Orange Book" containing the Occasional Offices (Mowbray, 1s. 6d.), and the "Grey Book" has entered its Third Part with Short Services for Occasional Use (Humphrey Milford, 1s. 6d.). The latter will be useful as a manual in addition to the Prayer Book, but can hardly be contained in it. The "Orange Book" will no doubt receive careful attention in the House of Clergy, when they come to that part of their work.

Our contemporary, *The Churchman*, in the course of its opposition to revision of the Liturgy, cites the "New Tracts for our Times" as symptomatic of the attitude of "at any rate a strong section of the extremists." We have not thought it worth while hitherto to allude to these documents; but we need hardly say that we warmly repudiate their whole standpoint, and we are certain that the vast bulk of the Anglo-Catholic movement does the same. Incidentally, we may point out that the writers of these tracts are as much opposed to the revised Liturgy as Bishop Knox himself. Such strange bed-fellows does the spirit of reaction make!

The Rev. C. Sadler, Rector of Hascombe, Godalming, writes with regard to our remarks in last month's issue on the effect of the totalizator in New Zealand:

"I came back [from a sea-voyage] via Panama, and most of my fellow-passengers were New Zealanders born and bred. There was only one opinion among them (as indeed among my friends out there) as to betting in N.Z.—it is a national vice."

Mr. Sadler encloses a letter from a prominent Dominion official, from which we take the following:

1. "Betting has increased enormously, not only in the aggregate, but per head of the population. Thus: 1891, per head, 16s.; 1900, 30s.; 1910, 38s.; 1914, 78s.; 1919, 128s.; 1921, 162s."

2. ". . . Women now bet very extensively. The very openness of the betting, the great dividends sometimes paid, have invested betting with a glamour it previously did not possess. The Government has found it necessary to prohibit newspapers from publishing the dividends."

3. [The tout and the bookie] "are prohibited by law, but flourish as the green bay tree. Prosecutions are numerous, but it is most difficult to secure a conviction. Judges have again and again commented on the scandal of juries refusing to convict.

"The income derived by the Clubs, 7½ per cent., has helped to increase the stakes greatly. This has attracted public attention and thus fostered the betting spirit. More and more clubs ask for permits to use the totalizator, for without its revenue they could not run race meetings. The more meetings, the greater the amount of secret gambling through bookies. . . ."

"In short, the totalizator has greatly increased the number of race meetings and the value of the stakes offered. It has thus given racing a publicity and a prominence it would not otherwise possess. Thus betting has enormously increased and the bookie has done anything but die out."

CORRESPONDENCE

The Headmaster of the King's School, Chester, writes:

"I have just received my copy of the March number of THEOLOGY. With reference to the article on 'Fasting and Abstinence' in that number, you may be interested in the following particulars of Roman Catholic practice in France to-day.

"I was in France during February and March of last year, and the following rules were in force in the dioceses of Bayeux and Coutances. On a fast-day ('jeûne') only the quantity of food is restricted; only one big meal is allowed, and besides this a 'collation,' as well as a still smaller meal in place of breakfast. Fasting is only obligatory on persons between the ages of twenty-one and sixty, and I gathered from private information that dispensations are granted rather readily. The fast-days appeared to be the same as in our Prayer Book, except that (1) most of the vigils were not so observed, but the Wednesdays of Advent were, and (2) the Assumption and All Saints' Day, as well as Christmas Day, cancelled a fast falling on them.

"Abstinence ('abstinence') referred only to the quality of food—*i.e.*, meat was forbidden. This applied to everyone. The days of abstinence were the same as the fasts, except that in Lent only the Wednesdays and Fridays are abstinences, whereas the whole season (except Sundays, Maundy Thursday, and Easter Eve after midday) is a time of fasting.

"This distinction would appear to bear out Bishop A. J. Maclean's account.

"The above rules were printed in an exactly identical form (except for the Bishop's signature) for the two dioceses of Bayeux and Coutances, as though they originated in some central office for France."

Canon A. G. Robinson writes from Winchester:

"You may think it worth while to record a little bit of evidence in support of the Bishop of Goulburn's statement as to the authorship of the poems in *Lyra Apostolica*. My own copy is a much later one than his, being one of the 13th edition published in 1864. It belonged originally to a member of Bishop Blomfield's family. On the fly-leaf are written the names of the six authors, and the poems are assigned to the various writers in exactly the same way as in the list written on the fly-leaf of the Bishop of Goulburn's copy."

[We have received two other letters corroborating this testimony from early editions.—ED.].

IN THE STUDY

By Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D., Edit. Sec. of S.P.C.K.

ADVICE ON BOOKS

If readers who require advice on courses of theological study or the choice of books care to write to the Editorial Department of S.P.C.K., an attempt will be made to give them the required information. Sixpence in stamps should be sent to cover the cost of the necessary correspondence. It will frequently be necessary to refer the inquiry to an expert; a number of well-known scholars have consented to help in this way. Sometimes, especially in the summer months, there may be a little delay in answering. The Editor reserves the right to publish answers if they are of sufficient general interest. In such cases the initials of the correspondents will be given.

STUDIES IN TEXTS

St. John xxi. 15-17: "Simon, son of John, lovest (*ἀγαπᾶς*) thou me more than these? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love (*φιλῶ*) thee. . . . He saith to him again a second time, Simon, son of John, lovest (*ἀγαπᾶς*) thou me? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love (*φιλῶ*) thee. . . . He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of John, lovest (*φιλεῖς*) thou me? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest (*φιλεῖς*) thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love (*φιλῶ*) thee."

Bishop Westcott's beautiful exegesis, alluded to in R.V. margin, is well known. The point of the passage lies in the two words for love. *Ἀγάπη* is the special word for Christian love, *φιλία* denotes the lower level of natural affection. Our Lord asks St. Peter twice whether he has a true love for Him. St. Peter dared not claim more than genuine natural affection. The third time our Lord comes down to the apostle's level and accepts all that St. Peter dares to offer. "Now the idea of loftiest love is given up." Is not this just the kind of exegesis which appealed to the great scholars of the nineteenth century, but can no longer be accepted? Against it the following considerations may be urged:

1. The distinction between higher and lower love is artificial. What is this higher Christian love which is to be distinguished from the love of our nearest and dearest? As St. Augustine says in his comment on the passage: "Demonstratur unum atque idem esse amorem et dilectionem."

2. The two Greek words both represent the same Hebrew word in the Septuagint, and, which is very significant, one Syriac word does duty for both in the Syriac versions of this passage.

3. Peter was grieved that "lovest thou me" was said for the third time. The obvious meaning is that the same thing had been said three times over.

4. An early Father, Justin Martyr, treats the words as synonyms (*Dial. c. Tryph.* xciii. 4).

5. A search in the Greek Fathers would probably reveal many examples of writers who presumably knew the shades of meaning in

Greek words, missing the alleged distinction in quoting Scripture. The following have come to my notice lately in the second volume of St. Basil's works. In *Const. Mon.* 573 B., John xxi. 15 is quoted thus: "φιλεῖς με πλέον τούτων"; and in *Serm. de Ren. Saec.* 203 B., Matt. x. 37, "he that loveth father or mother more than me" is quoted with ἀγαπῶν in place of φιλῶν.

6. But the really decisive argument is the usage of the Fourth Gospel elsewhere. The two words are apparently interchangeable in ch. xi.—see verses 3, 5, 36, referring to our Lord's love for Lazarus. They are certainly interchangeable in iii. 35, v. 20, which speak of the Father's love for the Son.

Elsewhere we can safely say that the love shown by the woman who loved much (Luke vii. 47, ἠγάπησεν) was not higher Christian love. And Christ's love to the rich young man (Mark x. 21, ἠγάπησεν) is generally taken to be natural human affection.

W. K. L. C.

LIST OF BOOKS ON PSYCHOLOGY

[Several correspondents have asked for guidance as regards books on psycho-analysis. The following list was kindly lent by the Rev. C. E. Hudson.]

A. Elementary.

1. Hart: *The Psychology of Insanity.* Perhaps the best bird's-eye view of the subject. Much wider than the title suggests. 2s.
2. Crichton Miller: *The New Psychology and the Teacher.* Jarrolds. 6s.
3. Hadfield: *Psychology and Morals,* contains, among other good things, a simple exposition of the nature and growth of sentiments. Methuen. 6s.
4. Brown: *Mental Analysis and Suggestion.* University of London. 3s. 6d.
5. Tansley: *The New Psychology and its Relation to Life.* An indispensable introduction to serious study. Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d.
6. Nicoll: *Dream Psychology.*

B. More Advanced.

1. Freud: *Introductory Lectures on Psycho-analysis.* A readable summary of the author's views. Allen and Unwin. 18s.
2. Freud: *The Interpretation of Dreams.* A classic. Allen and Unwin. 15s.
3. Freud: *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life.* On the manifestation of unconscious factors in the lives of normal people. Fisher Unwin. 12s. 6d.
4. Jones (Ernest): *Papers on Psycho-analysis.* A massive tome by the leading English Freudian. Baillière. 25s.
5. Jones (Ernest): *Essays in Applied Psycho-analysis.* Freudian principles applied to artistic, literary, and religious themes.
6. Jung: *Analytic Psychology.* The student must know the difference between Freudian and Jungian conceptions. Baillière. 15s.

7 and 8. Rivers: *Instinct and the Unconscious* and *Conflict and Dream.* These two books are of considerable importance; both contain carefully reasoned criticisms of some of Freud's theories. C.U.P. 16s.

9. McCurdy: *Problems in Dynamic Psychology.* Critical, by an American Freudian of independent mind.

10. Forsyth: *The Technique of Psycho-analysis.* Kegan Paul. 5s.

11. Bousfield: *Elements of Practical Psycho-analysis.* On the technique.

C. Psycho-analysis and Religion.

1. Thouless: *Introduction to the Psychology of Religion.* Indispensable; already a standard work. C.U.P. 7s. 6d.

2. Pratt: *The Religious Consciousness.* This big book takes full account, though not explicitly, save here and there, of psycho-analysis. Macmillan. 12s.

3. Hudson: *Recent Psychology and the Christian Religion.* Allen and Unwin. 3s. 6d.

4. Pym: *Psychology and the Christian Life.* A pioneer book, valuable as an introduction. S.C.M. 2s. 6d.

5. Underhill (Evelyn): *The Life of the Spirit and the Life of To-Day.* Methuen. 7s. 6d.

6. Barry: *Christianity and the New Psychology.* S.C.M. 5s.

7. Micklem: *Miracles and the New Psychology.* O.U.P. 7s. 6d.

8. Balmforth: *Is Christian Experience an Illusion?* S.C.M. 4s.

9. Pfister: *The Psycho-analytic Method.* The author is a German pastor.

10. Jones (Ernest): *Essays in Applied Psycho-analysis.* (See B. 5 above.)

11. Abraham: *Dreams and Myths.* Christian (and other) beliefs as projections of racial wishes.

12. Jung: *The Psychology of the Unconscious.*

N.B.—The last three books in this division are written from a definitely non-Christian point of view.

THE ANGLICAN EVANGELICAL GROUP MOVEMENT

Amongst recent developments in the Church of England, not the least noteworthy and significant is the sudden emersion into publicity of what is known as the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement.

This movement had its origin, in the early years of the century, amongst a group of Evangelical clergymen, working in or near Liverpool, who began to meet regularly together for the purpose of prayer and study. From Liverpool the movement spread over the greater part of the country as similar small " groups " were formed in other centres. An unwillingness to add yet another to the numerous Church societies led the Group Brotherhood, as it began to be called by its members, to remain a private, almost a secret, organization. Certain events within the Evangelical party during the year just past, however, together with the realization that secrecy meant suspicion and misunderstanding on the part of those outside, caused the movement in June, 1923, publicly to declare its principles, and to invite application for membership. For the present such membership is restricted to the clergy, and the objects, prayer and

study, are retained, and none are accepted who have not the willingness to realize them. Thus the movement is in no sense a rival to the Anglo-Catholic or any other similar body of Church people.

The new title adopted on coming out into the open is cumbersome and lacking in elegance: it has the merit, however, of representing, as a shorter title would fail to do, the various elements combined in the movement. It is Anglican because the members wish to express their loyalty to the Church of England, and their "claim to share in its rich heritage." It is Evangelical because its members feel that much as they may differ from their spiritual fathers in many things, yet by their emphasis on spiritual religion, on freedom, on reliance on the Gospel rather than on tradition, they stand in true succession to them.

But, although the members are predominantly Evangelical in sympathy, the movement is not partisan; it does not exist for purposes of party organization, or to carry on warfare against others whose views may be of a different character. At the same time, it need hardly be said, the members as individuals are left with complete liberty of action to make their influence felt, either alone or in conjunction with others, in any way which may appeal to them. One striking sign of the width of the movement can be found in the fact that the committee includes an associate of the Fraternity of the Resurrection.

It has often been observed that an unfortunate effect of the Tractarian Movement was to turn the Evangelicals into "Low Churchmen": the new movement seems likely to roll away this reproach, and in the pamphlets issued in its name there is much that is surprisingly similar to the teaching of the Anglo-Catholic Congress books. This striking approach to agreement, as it effects questions concerning the Holy Communion, was pointed out in the *Guardian* for March 28 last, in a leading article entitled "The Sacrament of Unity." Can it be that the combination of prayer and study which is the avowed aim of the movement, though by no means its monopoly, is working a real enlightenment of the Church and so drawing its members into a greater measure of agreement?

In the volume entitled *Liberal Evangelicalism*, written by members of the movement, there was an exceedingly unfortunate disproportion in the amount of space allotted to the Church, the Sacraments, and the Ministry: a disproportion which becomes the more evident if reference be made to the space given to these subjects in *Lux Mundi*, a volume which, perhaps not very happily, has been suggested as a fitting object for comparison. This implied belittling of such vastly important subjects does not represent the true character of the movement, and in more recent utterances, through the pamphlets, a wiser proportion has been restored.*

The Church of England makes a threefold appeal: to Scripture, to Tradition, and to Sound Learning. There is need for all schools of thought to enter into friendly rivalry, in order to restore to the Church its great reputation for sound learning; and the sympathetic interest of all Anglicans ought surely to be extended to those who are endeavouring, in a party which has perhaps least valued learning in the past, to found their faith on this traditional Anglican basis.

L. Elliott Binns.

* A second volume of *Liberal Evangelicalism* is to appear in the autumn dealing with the Inner Life, and in this volume there will be greater emphasis placed on the Sacrament of Holy Communion.

REVIEW

MORAL THEOLOGY. By the Rev. F. J. Hall, D.D., and the Rev. F. H. Hallock, D.D. Longmans. 10s. 6d.

Once again a book on Moral Theology forces upon us the question: What is really required in that manual of Moral Theology of which it is unanimously agreed that Anglican clergy and ordinands stand in need? We trust that Dr. Hall, who, with Dr. Hallock's assistance, has now completed by this volume his *Summa* of Anglican Theology, will forgive us if we devote some part of our review to this problem.

Moral Theology appears to be that form of study which will enable the priest, in his capacity both as preacher and director, to enunciate judgments upon conduct in agreement with the specific genius of Christianity. Such a definition gives the term its widest extension. But in practice two branches of the subject seem to require special treatment; and it is to these that the title Moral Theology is often (by convenient usage) confined. The nature of responsible action and the general principles of Christian conduct as a whole may be studied under the title of Christian ethics; the general principles of that branch of conduct concerned with the innermost life of the Christian with God, and their application to special needs and situations, under the title of Pastoral and Ascetic Theology. Both of these are living subjects, and new light and new problems continually emerge as the result of psychological research; yet it may with reason be said that Anglican clergy are not wholly unacquainted with either of them; and certainly ample guidance is available in books both ancient and modern, of which a considerable number find their way into every clerical library. But with the two branches to which we have alluded the case is different: on these guidance is confused, and they are often treated almost by rule of thumb. They are, first, the statement of the degree to which the Christian, by virtue of his membership in the Church, is bound to conform to the considered judgment of the Church in matters of conduct even though his own conscience does not explicitly endorse it; and second, the discussion of the particular duties of any given Christian in circumstances of special doubt and difficulty. In other words, what is required is a study first of *ecclesiastical authority*, and secondly of *cases of conscience*.

The need for the second of these two is apparent in every branch of the Christian Church. But the need for the former

is particularly pressing in the Anglican Communion, because it is clear that we have at the present moment neither a formulated theory nor a consistent working practice of what is commonly called ecclesiastical authority and discipline. It is very significant that in the greatest attempt at a Moral Theology which the Church of England has ever produced—the *Ductor Dubitantium*—one of the four books is devoted to the problem of casuistry, two to that of law and authority; whilst the fourth, dealing with the question of responsible action, is really only subsidiary to both these main issues.

Contrast this with any Roman Catholic manual. After the introduction on the nature of morality it plunges at once into the problem of the doubtful conscience and its guidance, and thereafter into a fully articulated theory of the different kinds of law. (The order is occasionally inverted.) First principles of this kind having been established, the author is free to enunciate the laws of his Church in detail, following one or other of the schemes commonly in vogue; and can say of each " law " exactly what degree of obligation it carries with it—whether *sub gravi*, *sub levi*, in *foro conscientiæ*, or in *foro extremo* or the like. The reason why Anglican books fail to satisfy is that either (as in the *Ductor Dubitantium*) the preliminary work of laying down first principles on the subjects mentioned is necessarily so vast that secondary, though more immediately practical, questions are excluded; or that, if such preliminary work is neglected, the result is either a string of *obiter dicta* (" Every Christian ought to do so and so . . .") or a book with some degree of devotional value for the normal Christian, but little fitted for the particular needs of clergy who have to advise in difficult cases. We may hold, if we will, that the Roman theory of authority is distorted and the practice based upon it faulty in consequence; but it is surely obvious that *some* theory is necessary before any consistent practice is evolved at all.

It has further to be observed that general agreement upon an Anglican conception both of authority and of principles of casuistry will not be reached until a considerable period of discussion, theorizing, and criticism has elapsed. We have yet to pass through our scholastic era. Books of what Dr. Hall calls the " contributory " kind will be necessary—and that in abundance—before we can find firm ground for " Manuals " to stand upon. Principles such as we need do not grow by the wayside, nor can they be taken ready made from a communion whose genius, fruitful though it is, appears to be very different from our own. So long as our foundation is not laid, " Manuals " are in danger of being a snare rather than a help.

It would seem ungenerous, if not unjust, to approach the consideration of Dr. Hall's *Manual* in the spirit of these last paragraphs. In Dr. Hall's sight, the preliminary thinking has all been done; he speaks rather disparagingly of books of a contributory character. There are times when all of us must feel a like impatience in a permissible eagerness to cut the cackle and come to the horses. But it may yet be suggested that the horses, to which Dr. Hall undoubtedly comes at the earliest possible moment, are still rather dark horses. Thus on the subject of ecclesiastical law his main standpoint is clear. The precepts of the Church [under which is included "every kind of obligation known to be imposed by the Church, whether by canon, by liturgical, rubrical, or sacramental prescription, or by recognized custom"] may not be dispensed by mere private caprice, and judicial decisions and decrees have authority in their interpretation. "An individual Christian is bound by ecumenical precepts and by those of his own portion of the Church" (p. 14). That is clear enough; what we miss is any recognition of the fact that in our "portion of the Church" there are innumerable controversies as to the meaning and extent of "canon, liturgical, rubrical and sacramental prescription"—still more of recognized custom—and that judicial decisions and decrees have not, as yet, cut or untied the knots. But, apart from this oversight, Dr. Hall frequently suggests, both in the text and even most in footnotes, that this rigidity of outline needs considerable mitigation, without indicating *how* or *by whom* or *within what limits* such mitigation is legitimate. Thus on p. 15 "moral principles are larger than the rules which are deduced from them, and are insusceptible of exclusively technical consideration;" p. 140 (note), "Orthodoxy does not lie in rigid technicalities, but in the truths which catholic technicalities are designed to preserve;" p. 155, "modern conditions make it impossible for many people to fulfil these rules according to their full letter; in such cases, however, the spirit of the law remains in force, and full observance ought to be approximated so far as conditions and circumstances permit." It is apparently left to the individual to decide how far his conditions and circumstances at any given time permit neglect of the law; and thereby the validity and authority of law, so fully advocated at other points by Dr. Hall, is considerably impaired.

Passages such as those last quoted suggest that Dr. Hall would reject strict legalism in any wise dealing with souls. Yet it cannot be denied that the general tenor of his *Manual* is legalistic; he speaks confidently of the "law of natural reason" (p. 100) and the "revealed will of God with regard to our

conduct" (p. 96) without realizing for a moment what intense difficulties those ancient phrases present when brought to the test of thoughtful reflection and criticism; and he only increases our difficulties by his succinct definition of 'law' as "that which is fixed and set" (p. 97). Similarly, to say that "the revealed moral law is found primarily in two documents, the Old Testament Decalogue and our Lord's twofold summary in the Gospels"—the latter being "permanently binding upon all who have learned it" (p. 103)—implies an approach to the Bible which the legitimate and welcome results of modern criticism have beset with serious pitfalls. We confess that to those with whom both "nature" and "revelation" are much more fluid terms than they were to the Schoolmen, this section of the book must appear very insecurely founded.

Turning to the question of casuistry, on which so much of importance remains to be written, it is a shock to find that—except for a couple of pages early in the book, and a few more later on (pp. 44, 45; 189, 190; 218-220), it is completely ignored. On the basis of Dr. Hall's modified legalism—his frequent suggestion that, by the intervention of "circumstance" (or, might it not be better to say, of "other" if not "higher" laws) *prima facie* applications of a precept may from time to time be set aside—this is peculiarly unfortunate. Rome has solved the problems of casuistry, in the main, by the multiplication of "more probable" opinions—defining the exact degree to which, for instance, the reading of the manuscript of a "prohibited" book, or the use of the bicycle or the enjoyment of hunting by the clergy, is "most probably" sinful or not sinful—thus withdrawing such problems from the sphere of casuistry to that of law.* Dr. Hall's protest against "legalism" would presumably (and, we think, rightly) deter him from such a course. The alternative open in such cases is to appeal to "sanctified common-sense," but even those who most possess this virtue commonly express a desire for some guidance of principle upon which to decide; and the full discussion and statement of such principles must be the work of an enlightened casuistry.

We have tried to indicate the directions in which it would appear desirable that the new revival in Moral Theology among Anglicans should advance, and to estimate Dr. Hall's contribution from that point of view. In so doing we have found it inevitable to lay stress upon what appear to us to be the *desiderata* of his *Manual*. It is a more grateful task to conclude with a warm appreciation of its merits. To those who agree in the main with its author's conception of authority, it will present a wise and restrained summary of the main

* See, *e.g.*, Guy-Ferreres, *Compendium*, v., 678, 61, Arnegie, *Compendium*, 278.

principles of conduct which "should be observed" among Anglicans, and we feel sure that it will be of real use to them, though (in view of its scope) more in their public teaching than in their private direction of individual difficulties. Those, on the other hand, who regard the problem of authority as one on which no very clear light is yet available, will yet recognize in Dr. Hall's statement the expression of a point of view which certainly is compatible with the completest loyalty to Anglicanism, and will welcome it as perhaps the clearest expression of that point of view which has yet been attained. They will, moreover, find themselves in the warmest agreement with much, if not most, of Dr. Hall's presentation of the duties of a Christian man, though they may differ as to the particular character of the authority on which his presentation is based. The *Manual* in fact is of high value as summarizing a stage now reached, and, we believe, firmly held for Anglican Moral Theology, and though we cannot agree that it is anything more than a stage, we welcome the book very cordially for the admirable way in which it discharges that function, and we must express a particular sense of gratitude for the excellent bibliography with which it concludes.

K. E. Kirk.

NOTICES

King Hezekiah. By Canon W. H. T. Gairdner. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

The Good Samaritan. By Canon W. H. T. Gairdner. S.P.C.K. 6d.

Pilate. By F. C. Palmer. Burrow and Co. 6s.

Not long since, Mr. St. John Ervine, abandoning criticism of the "commercial theatre," declared that only when the drama renews its ancient alliance with religion will it recover that simplicity for lack of which it is moribund. That such a revival is toward signs are not wanting. Not only are Miracles and Mysteries being written once more, but Guilds of Parochial Players are coming together to present them, sometimes—as of old—in the church itself.

In the S.P.C.K. list, seven plays already bear Canon Gairdner's name. Nor is he ill-equipped for his task. He has a scholar's acquaintance with Biblical history, a sensitive appreciation of dramatic form, and a practical knowledge of the East.

King Hezekiah elucidates the tragedy of that King's reign, and its connection with the disastrous alliances of Judah. The entente with Assyria and the pact with Egypt, supported by the premier, the cynical opportunist Shebna, condemned by Isaiah, accepted in a moment of weakness by the King, are the cause of Judah's downfall. God's forgiveness is announced by the sudden and mysterious destruction of Sennacherib and his host. As will be seen, the play is not without its application to our times. As the King beholds the pitiable refugees from the Assyrian advance, he exclaims: "Lo, the son of David has sinned; but

these sheep, what have they done ?" It is the cry of the upright ruler throughout history.

The play is good reading; though it calls for considerable stage properties, it would act effectively, for it shows real dramatic power. We would instance particularly the sudden appearance of Isaiah at the debauch, the scene with Rabshakeh, and the final destruction of the enemy's hosts. The language is on the whole successful, but there is an occasional uncertainty about the third person singular. We find in close conjunction " He willeth not "; " It runs away "; " Not all thou sayest liketh me "; " He despiseth us "; " He shuts the gates "; and for the opening words of the King, " What's the matter ?" is a little unhappy.

The Good Samaritan, a simple and attractive little work, shows the same skill in creating an Oriental atmosphere. The weaving of the characters of the parable into the Life of our Lord is convincingly done. Especially good is the close of the play, with its Hosanna chorus.

Mr. Palmer's *Pilate*, a tragedy in four acts, opens just after the Crucifixion, and closes with the suicide of Pilate, who is at last convinced that he " slew his God." The coming together at Rome of Antipas, Agrippa, and Pilate, and Caligula's infatuation for Claudia, Pilate's wife, are skilfully used to work out the action of the play. The language used lacks consistency. One seems to be distressingly poised between prose and heroic verse. " Generally," says Claudia, " a dream is a faint subconscious vision that fades away, if not actually at the time of awaking, a very little while afterwards." " But, my dear Claudia," replies Pilate, " I cannot bring my wife's dreams into official reports !" As the play proceeds this style is forgotten, and we lapse into almost unbroken decasyllables. Thus Antipas: " I do admit that things go hard with you. But be not too impatient of misfortune. Not within all the cities of the world is there a house without its tragedy, or man or woman without secret grief. As to your wife, I think you are mistaken. . . ." The contrast seems to us unfortunate. It detracts from the merit of an effectively constructed drama.

B. C. Boulter.

The Prophetic Consciousness. By M. D. R. Willink, S.Th. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

" This book aims at providing materials for an inquiry into the nature of the prophetic consciousness. The descriptions given in the Old and New Testaments of the modes in which revelations were received have been classified and compared with similar incidents recorded by writers ranging from Palladius and the medieval mystics to modern missionaries and psychologists." So the " jacket " of this volume, which therefore promises a study of great importance to Biblical exegesis. In recent years the psychology of the prophets of the Old Testament has received a great deal of attention from students who have made Hebrew literature their special study, but while they have not overlooked the fact that similar phenomena have appeared elsewhere, there seems to have been no serious attempt to collect and correlate the facts. It is high time that adequate attention should be given to this side of the subject, and everyone who is interested in the further elucidation of the problem will welcome a new book on the question.

At the same time it must be confessed with deep regret that Miss Willink has entirely failed on one important side of her work. The reader should be warned—if the fact is not patent—that she is an unsafe

guide on matters relating to the Old Testament. Nearly all her references betray a want of thorough acquaintance with the subject, and suggest that she is relying on a somewhat superficial study of English or other translations. To save multiplication of instances, it will suffice to refer to her treatment of Samuel. She quotes freely, it is true, from Dr. Skinner's *Prophecy and Religion* (whose title, strangely enough, is incorrectly given on p. viii), but seems to be entirely unaware of the whole background of thought which that great work implies.

When allowance is made, however, for this weakness, it may be said that the book has a real value. Miss Willink might have spread her net wider, and included a discussion of phenomena appearing in other religions, but no one can quarrel with her for confining herself to Christianity and Judaism. Her illustrations are selected with care, and good use is made of them. No doubt there will be readers who will differ from her in some of the conclusions which they draw from the evidence she offers, but that does not in the least detract from the value of the facts collected and described. She writes with sympathy and care of the great mystics whom she cites, and seems to have done them justice.

Above all, it is difficult to speak too highly of the spirit and general outlook which the book exhibits. "Man has been so planned that in case of need God can use the eyes and ears He has made to convey intimations from Himself at times when other methods are not available" (p. 42). Here is, perhaps, one of the deepest secrets of Divine Revelation. And the last short chapter, "Some Considerations," will appeal to every devout reader, scholarly or illiterate, as being just the right kind of conclusion to draw from the whole subject.

T. H. Robinson.

The Necessity of Art. By A. Clutton Brock, Percy Dearmer, A. S. Duncan-Jones, J. Middleton Murry, A. W. Pollard, and Malcolm Spencer. Student Christian Movement. 7s. 6d.

Agreed as to the general principles of the philosophy of aesthetic, and fortified by a series of conferences, these six writers have combined to produce a volume of essays, which is intended "to increase among artists the sense of their high vocation and to further in the world at large the conviction, already widespread, that art is necessary to spiritual life." The fact that the essays include the last piece of work to come from Mr. Clutton Brock will, no doubt, lay upon his numerous admirers the necessity of buying the book, and they will find that it contains much food for thought.

The first and the last essays provide the clue to the writer's position. Dr. Dearmer, in a brief final paper, treats of the doctrine of values, while Mr. Clutton Brock, in the introductory essay, written with keen psychological insight, presents art to the ordinary man as a way of escape from banality, a method of deliverance from the undifferentiated mass into selfhood and true happiness, not by the release of a something ready-made within, but by creative expression. With Browning he would say:

> "I want to know a butcher paints,
> A baker rhymes for his pursuit,
> Candlestick-maker much acquaints
> His soul with song, or, haply mute,
> Blows out his brains upon the flute."

An original essay on "The Art of Movement," by Mr. Duncan-Jones, deserves to be closely associated with Mr. Clutton Brock's paper, for its

emphasis on the creative value of activity and for its psychological understanding of social worship, which is religion, and includes art.

Two essays are devoted to a consideration of the relations between art and the Christian religion, for the benefit of the artist. In order to deliver him from the widely prevalent suspicion of Christianity it is necessary to show what asceticism really stands for, particularly that form of it known as puritanism, and to provide evidence of fact as well as explanatory argument. In the longest essay of the seven Dr. Dearmer has no difficulty in demonstrating the truth that "Christendom has produced the greatest volume of the greatest art in human history." Just as Mr. Duncan-Jones pillories the Cambridge Mediæval History for its unaccountable neglect of the glories of Christian music, and as Dr. Dearmer himself has occasion to contradict the *Encyclopædia Britannica* in its teaching on Æsthetics, so here he buries under a mountain of facts Sir William Orpen's monstrous assertion that Christianity has been a persistent foe to art. But Dr. Dearmer does not understand asceticism, whether Catholic or Protestant. He calls it "that common disease of religion," he speaks of "the bleak indifference of our puritan tradition," and he describes the asceticism of the Counter-Reformation as "morbid Puritanism more profound than anything to be found among Protestants." Mr. Malcolm Spencer, reading its significance in relation to art more truly, declares in his paper on "The Puritan Objection to Art" that "asceticism for the sake of an idea is of the essence of all artistic triumph": and he is right.

Two essays remain, those of Dr. A. W. Pollard and Mr. J. Middleton Murray. Written in excellent taste and with a fine appreciation of the religious possibilities of art and literature, they nevertheless betray the weakness of the Truth-Beauty-Goodness quest as a substitute for the religion which is attachment to a Person, and they suggest that it may well prove an easier task to persuade religion to a full use of art than to convince art that it is not the whole of religion: but perhaps it is true that the former is the only way in which there is any hope of achieving the latter, and in that is to be found the justification of this interesting book.

O. S. HARDMAN.

AN ANGLO-CATHOLIC'S THOUGHTS ON RELIGION. By the late Rev. G. C. Rawlinson. Edited with a Memoir, by W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. Foreword by Lord Halifax. Longmans, Green and Co. **7s. 6d.**

Dr. Sparrow Simpson deserves to be thanked for the care with which he has edited these remains of the work of a gifted priest and for the introductory memoir in which he tells straightforwardly the simple story of his life, wisely leaving us to distil out the quality of the man from his own writings.

Mr. Rawlinson's type is far from common, but it has a wide range of attraction. Hampered by physical disability, and drawn by his spiritual bias to seek the company and breathe the air of mystics and ascetics, he stands over against the sort of Christianity that is known as "muscular," and yet impresses by reason of his strength. An uncompromising Catholic, unusually well informed as to the currents of continental Catholicism, especially in France, and always alive to the full vision in the matter of reunion, he yet preserved an open mind for the hearing of men whose

search for truth was being painfully and, perhaps, dangerously continued, and he met the modernist with unexpected understanding. Wielding no influence through ecclesiastical position, or through books, or, until the last years, as speaker or preacher in large assemblies, he yet assisted very many by the quiet exercise of his priestly office, he gave wise counsel to leaders who resorted to him, as Lord Halifax generously acknowledges in his Foreword, and he influenced thousands by his journalistic work, though necessarily unrecognized by the majority of his readers.

The contents of the book are arranged in four parts: Sermons on Some Catholic Types, Studies in Mysticism, with four other papers of a miscellaneous nature; Three Anglo-Catholic Congress Papers, together with an illuminating article on the present state of the Church of England; and at the end of the book an interesting collection of stray throughts and lecture-notes found among the author's papers. Throughout these pages there is the sure touch of one who is thoroughly at home with his subject, and is convinced that he knows and possesses what the world needs. The renunciation and asceticism of Charles de Foucauld, the mysticism of St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross, and the spiritual wisdom of St. Francis de Sales displayed in the direction of souls, this was the type of subject that appealed to Mr. Rawlinson as of supreme importance, and to subjects such as these he devoted himself in his tiny flat, "five stories up and no lift to reach it," convinced that "the moral and spiritual history of the race is not worked out by mobs, but by quiet men in studies." May his work and memory help to produce more priests like him.

O. S. HARDMAN.

BOOK NOTES

The Book of Amos. By T. H. Robinson. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

Dr. Robinson is to be congratulated on this splendid little book, which gives a critical Hebrew text, with very full grammatical notes, and a complete vocabulary, in which every word which presents the slightest difficulty is parsed. Here is the opportunity for the student who wants to begin Hebrew. With knowledge of the alphabet, the Revised Version, and a Hebrew grammar at his side and a little perseverance, he can enjoy Hebrew from the outset if he starts on this edition of Amos. A wide sale, to encourage Dr. Robinson to continue his good work, is much to be desired.

First Notions of Holy Writ. By C. Lattey, S.J. Longmans. 3s. 6d.

Father Lattey's Biblical studies are followed with interest outside his own communion. Much of what he says here, ably expressed though it is, has little appeal to Anglicans. But the chapter on Inspiration can be warmly welcomed as throwing light on a difficult problem, the solution of which is too readily abandoned nowadays. A theory of "non-verbal" inspiration is propounded, that the Divine action is "confined to the formation of ideas and the desire to express them, and it would belong to God's ordinary supernatural Providence to see to it that they found fitting expression." This is the theory held by the Biblical text-book in use in French seminaries.

The Influence of the Church on Modern Problems. Papers by various writers read at the [American] Church Congress in 1922. Macmillan. 7s.

Church Congresses are well managed in America, if we may judge by these excellent papers. Seven subjects are discussed: The Moral Revolt of the Young, Credal Requirements and Church Reunion, The Second Coming of Christ, Psychoanalysis, Labour's Demand for Continuous Employment, Young Men's Hesitancy to enter the Ministry, The Revival of Interest in Prayer. The first section is painful reading, revealing a state of things which would be incredible in England. (For instance, girls are said to visit men's dormitories in college towns after midnight.) The moral breakdown is said to be largely the result of divorce, vast numbers of young people having no parents' example to help them.

A few quotations may be of interest:

"The young women of Miss Austen's novels embroidered, discussed the merits of gentlemen and walked in the shrubbery (*whatever that may be*)." A very illuminating remark, significant of the possibilities of misunderstanding between two English-speaking peoples. "A chief characteristic of the American Episcopal Church is its unfailing amiability." "If I desired, I could receive Protestant ministers into the Church almost every month. . . . But I didn't want them and the Church couldn't use them." "It is hopeless in our generation to expect reunion with Rome. We might as well try to effect a union with the Standard Oil Company." A certain American college determined "to show its appreciation of Christian work by bestowing the degree Bachelor of Divinity, *in absentia*, upon St. Paul."

The Way of the Church: An explanatory outline of History, Worship, and Practice for English Catholics. By K. D. Mackenzie. Mowbray. 2s. 6d.

The purpose of this little book is to explain the Eucharist to layfolk, in the light of that Catholic faith and practice of which it is the centre. It is specially intended for imperfectly instructed adherents of advanced Churches, but will prove very useful to Churchmen generally in that it makes clear what the "extremists" are after. Many who agree with the author in the main as regards his doctrinal basis will question the wisdom of some of the practical measures which he recommends. Even an unsympathetic reader will be struck by the Christian charity and restrained fervour which pervades this beautiful little book.

Jesus and Civil Government. By A. T. Cadoux. Allen and Unwin. 6s.

Dr. Cadoux has written one of the strongest and sanest books on the authority of the State that we have ever read. Its chief message is for pacificists, Tolstoyans, etc., with whom he is evidently in close contact; clearly he has felt the force of their arguments and the necessity of working out the problem for himself. But Anglicans will find his book most valuable. The close association of the Church of England with the State and the instinctive tendency of its members to support the powers that be are weaker than formerly, and it is well to be reminded how much old-fashioned Anglicanism had to say for itself in this respect. Two points may be emphasized in an exceptionally interesting book. Luke xii. 36 (the command to buy a sword) is fully discussed with a startling

result—Our Lord is said to have deliberately recalled the pacificist precepts of the Sermon on the Mount. And very wise things are said about the Church and politics. High-minded politicians are bound to carry out the behests of a lower moral will than their own. If the Church advocates specific reforms, they must either be unworthy of the Church's ideals, to the detriment of her influence, or worthy, in which case, if carried out, they are too far in front of the popular mind to be successful, and will provoke a harmful reaction. The Church's true work is to raise the moral level of the popular will.

A Psychological and Poetic Approach to the Study of Christ in the Fourth Gospel. By Eva Gore-Booth. Longmans. 8s. 6d.

From internal evidence one would gather that the author is a lady of Quaker antecedents strongly attracted by Theosophy. If this impression is justified, it is not surprising that from our standpoint the book is not to be recommended. The reader is prejudiced by a statement in the Preface that words are not used in their commonly accepted meanings. Many curious statements are made. For example: "Matter, emotion, thought, and prayer" are "different modes (or perhaps rates) of vibration" (p. 12). "The outline between life and death is really only an imaginary kind of equator" (p. 19). Stress is laid on the difference between *psyche* and *spirit* in the first verse of the *Magnificat*. "Vessels" in Mark xi. 16 means dead bodies of animals" (p. 177). Reincarnation is taught (p. 34) and justified by extraordinary exegesis (p. 134). All punishments and "dominations" of children are condemned (p. 114). The real meaning of the Cleansing of the Temple is Christ's condemnation of the killing of animals, which copyists have depraved (p. 172). The same corrupters of the text have introduced a bodily Resurrection (p. 343). On p. 153 we read "it seems there is no such thing as human, as opposed to divine."

The writer gives a touching account of her religious experiences, and possibly a more sympathetic reviewer would find something to praise in her book.

Jesus Lover of Men. By Wilton Rix. Allen and Unwin. 2s. 6d.

The life of Christ is here told in a kind of *vers libres*, rhythmical prose cut into lengths. One or two specimens will show what the book is like. The Temptation:

"He seeks the wilderness that he may face his own thoughts without distraction.
He does not go to his placid Nazareth hills, but to the bare desert.
He must see the hard lines of his Heavenly Father's face.
He must wrestle—not rest. . . .
The plaintive cry of the curlew smote upon his ear like a wounded man crying for help.
For food he ate locusts, wild honey, and berries, and he got very hungry."

And the finale:

"Amid his thousands God threw up a truly humane one.
Strong as a man, tender like a woman.
Human instinct claims him to be like God.
So people worship him."

The chapters were delivered as sermons to an Ealing congregation on Sunday mornings. No doubt the congregation thought them very modern, but the view of our Lord taught by implication would have been perfectly familiar to the Homoiousians of the fourth century. It would be charitable to suppose that Mr. Rix has not thought out his position.

The Religion of Wise Men. By G. F. Wates. Allen and Unwin. 4s. 6d.

This book is sufficiently described by a sentence in the Preface: "A creed manufactured by princes and ecclesiastics centuries before Galileo was born is an anachronism in the twentieth century." THEOLOGY exists to advocate historic Christianity, and there is not enough first hand work in Mr. Wates' book to justify our recommending readers to buy it in order to learn about other conceptions of religion.

The Churchman's Glossary of Ecclesiastical Terms. By E. G. C. F. Atchley and E. G. P. Wyatt. Mowbray. 6s.

Two well-known laymen have collaborated in producing this useful book, which includes terms found in mediæval inventories and wills besides the ordinary liturgical and theological words. The subjects dealt with on p. 80 are typical: Garth, Gasinges (= spectacles), Gaudete (= 3rd Sunday in Advent) Genealogies, Genuflexion, George, Feast of S., Gesina, S. Mary in, Gete (= jet), Gilbertines, Gild, Girdle, Glaucous. For the ordinary Churchman longer notices of well-known things would have been helpful. Thus Litany is treated in 21 words, while Tricanale (one occurrence only is known and it is doubtful whether it existed) has 71 words. The explanation of Modernism is out of place in a scientific book.

Christian Monism. By E. Wasmann. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 4s.

Fr. Wasmann is a distinguished Jesuit scientist who conducted some years ago a famous controversy with Haeckel. Interesting details about his career are provided by Mr. Spencer Jones in an Introduction. Some of his scientific works have been translated into English. The present book is a collection of devotional addresses.

Malcolm Archibald. A Memoir. S.C.M. 3s. 6d.

This little record of a devoted priest taken away when still young consists of a brief memoir, some lectures on Philippians, and four sermons. The latter are scarcely worthy of print (a passage on p. 153, for example, would not have been passed by the author for publication: "Look at Robert Louis Stevenson—one of the greatest literary writers. Have you read any of his books? You ought to read them"), but criticism is disarmed by the note on the title-page "printed for private circulation." Mr. Archibald played an important part in that movement in which Oxford Evangelicalism broadened out to an S.C.M. basis. Afterwards as chaplain of Sandhurst, Vicar of St. Jude's, Southsea, and, when his health collapsed, unattached worker in the Winchester diocese, he turned many to righteousness. The fragrance of a rare personality breathes in these pages.

New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's. By A. H. McNeile, Cambridge University Press. 10s.

Good text-books on New Testament teaching are not easy to find; the older ones are obsolete and their place has not yet been filled. Dr. McNeile's, though not exhaustive, will be extremely useful. He is thoroughly abreast of contemporary criticism, possesses the characteristic caution of a Cambridge scholar who knows the whole Bible at first hand, and, above all, he is a teacher, understanding from long experience and instinctive sympathy the didactic method of approach. His present book is written from a novel angle. The various documents of the New Testament are studied first for their own sakes, then in comparison with St. Paul. This gives a freshness to the book, but it might have been even more useful as a straightforward manual of New Testament theology. In the masterly summaries of St. James and 1 St. Peter the method is shown at its best. St. James, by the way, is said to have been written by a Christian writing for Jews and Christians at the same time and carefully choosing language which will be acceptable to both—a theory which solves a good many difficulties.

Mystical Initiation. By Dom S. Louismet, O.S.B. Burns Oates and Washbourne.

Dom Louismet's latest book is a devotional commentary on the Song of Songs. A few extracts will show its quality: "*Behold he cometh, leaping upon the mountains, skipping over the hills.* . . . The Bride . . . descries him bounding and leaping over all obstacles to come to her, with the alertness of the roe-buck." "Now that the youthful bride has been admitted to the nuptial bed of a complete self-abnegation, to the stripping herself of all things created and to a perfect self-surrender in the arms and upon the heart of her Jesus Crucified. . . ." "*His belly is as of ivory, set with sapphires.* The immaculate whiteness of the flesh of our Saviour was gleaming on the cross and was enhanced by the purple marks of the cruel flagellation." Unsympathetic critics would dismiss this as a psychological perversion. But ideas which appealed to Origen and St. Bernard cannot be treated so. The average Englishman looks on such devotions as at best a detached observer, but is he right? Do not St. Bernard and Dom Louismet practise that very sublimation of the sexual instinct which modern psychologists recommend as healthier than its suppression?

Tutankhamen and Egyptology. By S. A. B. Mercer. Mowbray. 6s. 6d.

A charming little book by a well-known American scholar, who with some boldness published in the autumn of 1923 an account of the first work on the famous tomb. One chapter propounds this view of the exodus: The Hebrew tribes left Egypt as occasion offered during 200 years: the Habiri about 1450, Simeon and Levi as early as 1375, Asher probably about 1355, Benjamin, Ephraim and Manasseh in 1225 under Merneptah. The "Israel" whom Merneptah found in Palestine in 1222 were fragments of the tribe of Judah, who pushed into southern Palestine instead of going round by the south-east with the rest of the last exodus.

The Confessions of St. Augustine. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 5s.

The version of Sir Tobie Matthew has been revised by Dom Hudleston of Downside. This is the first of a series of devotional classics to be

entitled *The Orchard Books*, to which we offer the warmest possible welcome. The present volume contains 400 pages of closely, but very clearly, printed matter, and is all a fastidious reader could wish.

Loaves and Fishes. By Bernard Vaughan, S.J. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 2s. 6d.

These short readings, taken from Father Vaughan's note-books, have no outstanding qualities, but will be welcomed by many as throwing further light on the remarkable priest whose biography by Father Martindale has been so widely read. W. K. L. C.

The Idea of Revelation. By W. R. Matthews, D.D. Longmans. Liverpool Diocesan Board of Divinity Publications, XXVIII. 1s. 6d.

In three lectures the Professor of the Philosophy of Religion at King's College, London, has dealt with the idea of Revelation as it can be extracted from the common use of the word inside and outside Christianity, but especially in the Old and New Testaments, and in Christianity up to and including Luther. He finds that it always involves personality—it is, primarily, something given in a personal life or through personal experience. He discusses the relation of belief in Revelation, so understood, to ideas of evolution, and the sense in which we can still believe that in Christianity there is a special and final Revelation. The last lecture examines the conception of the Supernatural and relates it to Revelation, and shows that both conceptions can be believed in without risk to true freedom of thought. This is a lucid and useful summary of much contemporary thought on important subjects.

The Significance of Life: A Short Study in Theism. By Ernest F. Champness. The Swarthmore Press. 2s. net.

This is a simple account, written in untheological language, of an argument for religion based on experience and reason. These last words are interpreted rather narrowly. "Experience" excludes, on the one hand, what is called "religious experience" in modern books on psychology, and also that concrete historical experience of God which is the reality of what we call Revelation. It is understood as the modern individual's experience of everyday life, and "reason," in a similar fashion, is understood in a subjective and individualistic sense. There is a valid argument for theism, doubtless, to be based on experience and reason, even when they are interpreted in this narrow fashion. But the religion so interpreted and expounded is vague and abstract, not the living natural religion of the Catholic Church, but an artificial thing, made in the study and valuable there. But the social values which Mr. Champness rightly holds to be the fruit of theism are not produced by any such paper religion, but by the revealed, dogmatic, institutional religion of Catholic Christendom. When he confesses that for him the undogmatic principle is more than a method, an argument *ad hominem*, and is a fundamental belief, he shuts himself off from historical Christianity. A. E. B.

Modernism and the Person of Christ. By W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. Robert Scott. 3s. 6d. net.

This is a very simple statement of the orthodox doctrine of the Person of Christ, its root in the Gospels and in the Apostolic experience and teaching in the New Testament, its expressions in the Chalcedon

theory of the One Person with two natures, and in what Dr. Sparrow Simpson seems to hold to be the alternative theory of kenosis as taught, for example, by Bishop Gore. This is stated in contrast with the theories of Christ's Person taught by English Modernists, like those of the Girton Conference of 1921, and German liberals like Loofs and Seeberg. If it has a fault, the book is too simple. Its account of the Christological discussions of the first five centuries is meagre, and modernists will perhaps think that more justice would have been done to them by a fuller examination of their principle that "there is not a vast gulf between the Divine Nature and the Human Nature." But, within its limits, the book is effective, and it has the great merit of being fair.

La Prière de Toutes les Heures. Par Pierre Charles, S.J. Bruges: Charles Beyaert. 5 fr.

A first series of meditations (there are to be three by the same author) inspired by the praiseworthy desire to present prayer as, not an accompaniment, but an integral part of practical life. The author looks to the growing custom of daily communion to destroy, in the minds of the faithful, the artificial distinction between religious duties and secular duties. His book aims at clearing a path in men's hearts for the Holy Ghost. Its emphasis on some aspects of ascetic theology—*e.g.*, his chapter on the Holy Mother of God—will seem strange to most Anglican readers, but if any members of our communion use it as a companion to their meditations, they can hardly fail to find help in it. A. E. B.

Select Passages illustrating Neoplatonism. By E. R. Dodds, B.A. S.P.C.K. London. 1923. xxiii+104. 5s.

This volume is the first of a series dealing with non-Jewish religious systems contemporaneous with the early days of Christianity, and its publication is very timely; for at the moment Platonism and Neoplatonism are being studied probably by larger groups of men than at any time in England since the days of the Cambridge Platonists in the seventeenth century. And this is to be laid partly to the credit of Dean Inge, on whose recommendation this book has been published. The Dean's own volumes on Plotinus, the Master of Philosophic Religious Mysticism, are being sought out by an increasing number of serious students; but the works of Proclus, "the Aristotle of Neoplatonism," and of the cultured Porphyry, and of others of the chain of sages, are little read at the present time. Yet, as Professor Dodds points out in his introduction, Origen, the most learned of the Fathers, was the pupil of the master of Plotinus, Ammonius Saccas, the founder of Neoplatonism; St. Augustine was greatly influenced by the writings of Plotinus himself; and the anonymous spiritual genius known as "Dionysius the Areopagite," who taught the foremost Christians for ten centuries both in the East and the West, drew not a little of his inspiration from Proclus. And Christians to-day can learn much that is valuable, even vital, from the Neoplatonic masters; one's chief regret is that Professor Dodds in his book gives extracts from practically only three of them: Plotinus, Porphyry, and Proclus. Still, the extracts provided are well chosen, and deal, among other subjects, with the One (God as the First Cause), the Divine Intelligence, the World Soul, the Human Soul, Matter, Good and Evil, and Beauty. Possibly one of the reasons why the Neoplatonic writings have been unduly neglected in modern days is because they are crammed so full of ideas that

they make hard reading and demand sustained thought. Yet they are well worth any labour bestowed on them; and not only is Professor Dodds to be congratulated on his volume, but the S.P.C.K. is to be congratulated on having done another piece of real service to the Church and the world by publishing it. And to quote Plotinus: "Nothing that is Real will perish."

HERBERT PENTIN.

The Teaching of Jesus and the Jewish Teaching of His Age. By T. Walker, D.D. Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

Dr. Walker's book is one of encyclopædic learning which can be consulted whenever a student wishes to learn about Jewish parallels to our Lord's teaching. It is divided into six sections—the Idea of God, the Kingdom of God, the Messiah, the Doctrine of Man, Salvation, the Hereafter. In each the parallels from Apocrypha and Pseudepigraphe are given, and then the relevant passages from the Gospels are collected and discussed.

We are grateful for the devoted labour spent on the book, but feel that it might have been planned in a more helpful way. Few but professed scholars will care to study the subject in such detail, and they will prefer books which give the originals of the passages. Certainly they will not be helped by remarks like that on p. 63, dealing with the phrase "my Father's house" in Luke ii. 49, John ii. 16—"The Greek text is not as identical as our English translation suggests." The book suffers from the author's excessive modesty. On nearly every page he quotes authorities in place of formulating judgments in his own words. Many of the writers on whom he relies are popularisers whose knowledge of this subject is far less than his own. Dr. Walker eschews the footnote entirely, with the result that many passages like this on p. 163 occur: "Upon this rock (*i.e.*, of my Messiahship, *cf.* 'rock' of Abraham, in Rabbinical literature, *J.Q.R.*, vol. xii., April, 1900, pp. 428*f.*) I will build my community; and Hades' gates (*i.e.*, the fact that death awaits me—*cf.* 'the gates of Hades,' meaning 'death'; 3 Macc. v. 51; Wisd. xvi. 13; Ps. Sol. xvi. 2; *cf.* Isa. xxxviii. 10) will have no power against it (*i.e.*, will not make ineffective my Messiahship) (Matt. xvi. 18)."

The Abiding Presence. S.C.M. 3s.

Through Prayer to Peace. Compiled by C. M. Whishaw. S.P.C.K. 3s.

Here are two devotional books of similar size, but different character. The first is typically S.C.M. It contains meditations, preparations for Holy Communion, litanies for India, Africa, etc. It is very modern—would any generation before this have thought of including in a book of printed devotions the following: "For dancing firelight upon the walls of a well-loved room, we thank Thee, Father of Lights"? To those who like modern prayers the book can be strongly recommended; also to those who like ancient devotions, as a change, but we think they will soon say "the old is better." Miss Whishaw's compilation is the product of many years' loving thought. If the S.C.M. book is twentieth century, hers is, for the most part, inspired by the solid piety of the nineteenth century, which a later generation than ours will probably find very attractive, but which has for the moment become slightly old-fashioned.

W. K. L. C.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER